0001
01 BEFORE THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD
01
02 SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL ON TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS
02
03 DR. JAMES PITTS, CHAIRPERSON
03
04
04
05
05
06
06
07 IN THE MATTER OF:)
07)
08 THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL)
08 ON TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS)
09 PUBLIC MEETING)
09 _____)
10
10
11
11
12
12
13
13
14
14
15 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
15
16 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA
16
17 MONDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1996
17
18
18
19
19
20
20
21
21
22 REPORTED BY:
22
23 MARCENA M. MUNGUIA,
23 CSR NO. 10420
24
24 JOB NO.:
25 ARB0783
25
0002
01 BEFORE THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD
01
02 SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL ON TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS
02
03 DR. JAMES PITTS, CHAIRPERSON

IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL)
ON TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS)
PUBLIC MEETING)
_____)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, TAKEN AT

THE ARNOLD AND MABEL BECKMAN CENTER OF THE

NATIONAL ACADEMIES OF SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING,

100 ACADEMY DRIVE, IRVINE, CALIFORNIA, COMMENCING

AT 9:45 A.M., ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1996,

HEARD BEFORE DR. JAMES PITTS, CHAIRPERSON,

REPORTED BY MARCENA M. MUNGUIA, A CERTIFIED

SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF

CALIFORNIA.

0003

APPEARANCES:

CHAIRPERSON: DR. JAMES PITTS

PANEL MEMBERS: DR. GARY FRIEDMAN
DR. JOHN FROINES
DR. STANTON GLANTZ
DR. JAMES N. SEIBER

06
07
07
08
08
09
09
10
10
11
11
12
12
13
13
14
14
15
15
16
16
17
17
18
18
19
19
20
20
21
21
22
22
23
23
24
24
25
25
0004
01 I N D E X
01
02 AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: PAGE
02
03 1 - UPDATE FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE 10
03 REGULATION'S ASSESSMENT PROGRAM:
04 TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT DOCUMENTS
04 TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT CANDIDATE DOCUMENT
05
05 2 - UPDATE FROM THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD AND 72
06 OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD
06 ASSESSMENT STAFFS ON THE DRAFT DOCUMENT
07 ON DIESEL EXHAUST AS A TOXIC AIR
07 CONTAMINANT
08
08 3 - PROGRESS REPORT ON ENVIRONMENTAL TOBACCO 140
09 SMOKE DOCUMENT, INCLUDING EXPOSURE AND

09 HEALTH EFFECTS OF E.T.S.
10
10 4 - UPDATE FROM AIR RESOURCES BOARD STAFF ON 157
11 THE TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT PROGRAM
11
12 5 - DISCUSSION OF FUTURE MEETING DATES AND 202
12 PROCEDURES
13
13
14
14
15
15
16
16
17
17
18
18
19
19
20
20
21
21
22
22
23
23
24
24
25
25
0005
01 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1996
02 9:45 A.M.
03
04
05 DR. PITTS: GOOD MORNING. I WANT TO WELCOME ALL
06 THE PANEL MEMBERS HERE AND MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE HERE
07 AND THE STAFFS OF THE O.E.H.H.A. AND THE A.R.B. AND THE
08 D.P.R. AND OTHER PUBLIC INDIVIDUALS INTERESTED IN OUR
09 SCHEDULE TODAY. IT'S AN INTERESTING ONE. IT WILL BE A
10 FULL AFFAIR AND OF SOME INTEREST.
11 BEFORE WE TAKE UP THE ITEMS AS CITED ON THE
12 OFFICIAL AGENDA, IT'S CUSTOMARY TO, I THINK, ASK THE
13 QUESTION, "ARE THERE ANY RELEVANT PREVIOUS BUSINESS ITEMS
14 FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS?" AND IT TURNS OUT THERE IS AN
15 ITEM THAT I THINK ALL OF YOU WILL FIND BOTH RELEVANT AND
16 INTERESTING AND CERTAINLY ONE THAT IS WORTH INTRODUCING
17 NOT ONLY AT THIS MEETING, BUT I'M SURE INTRODUCING AGAIN
18 THE WHOLE PEER REVIEW AND THE WHOLE SCIENTIFIC RISK
19 ASSESSMENT APPROACH OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.
20 MOVING AHEAD, AS WE DISCUSSED AT THE LAST
21 MEETING, DR. SEIBER AND HIS SPLENDID REPORT FROM THE
22 PANEL, THE COMMITTEE THAT CAME OUT; AND JIM HAS SOME NEWS
23 ON THAT. DR. SEIBER, WOULD YOU LIKE TO GIVE US THE NEWS

24 ON YOUR INCREDIBLE RESULT?
25 A REPORT WAS LISTENED TO. A REPORT OF
0006
01 DISTINGUISHED SCIENTISTS WAS, IN FACT, LISTENED TO AT HIGH
02 LEVELS AND WE'RE THRILLED AT THIS, AND JIM HAS GIVEN ME
03 COPIES FOR THE PANEL OF THE NEWS RELEASE, AND I'LL JUST
04 READ THE FIRST PART AND THEN JIM WILL FOLLOW AND TELL US
05 ALL ABOUT IT.
06 "SACRAMENTO. CALIFORNIA SECRETARY
07 FOR ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION, JAMES M.
08 STROCK, TODAY ACCEPTED A REPORT ON THE
09 AGENCY'S RISK ASSESSMENT PRACTICES
10 FROM A PRESTIGIOUS GROUP OF SCIENTISTS
11 AND ANNOUNCED PLANS TO IMPLEMENT" --
12 "PLANS TO IMPLANT ITS" -- "TO IMPLEMENT
13 ITS RECOMMENDATIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH
14 AN EXECUTIVE ORDER ISSUED YESTERDAY BY
15 GOVERNOR WILSON."
16 AND ON THAT NOTE, THE CHAIR OF THAT PANEL,
17 DR. SEIBER.
18 DR. SEIBER: WELL, THANK YOU VERY MUCH, JIM. IT'S
19 JUST A QUICK ANNOUNCEMENT. IT'S A FOLLOW-UP ON THE RISK
20 ASSESSMENT DISCUSSION THAT WE HAD PANEL REPORT AT THE LAST
21 S.R.P. MEETING.
22 AS YOU ALL KNOW, THE REPORT OF THE RISK
23 ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S OUT AND I BELIEVE YOU ALL
24 HAVE COPIES, COURTESY OF O.E.H.H.A. SO IF YOU DON'T, DOUG
25 PASCERELLA IS HERE AND A FEW OTHER FOLKS WHO WILL MAKE
0007
01 SURE THAT HAPPENS.
02 AND SECONDLY, ON FRIDAY, GOVERNOR WILSON
03 SIGNED AN EXECUTIVE ORDER, AS JIM MENTIONED, TO IMPLEMENT
04 THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE RISK ASSESSMENT ADVISORY PANEL,
05 AND I JUST WANTED TO QUOTE ALSO FROM A LETTER THAT I
06 RECEIVED FROM GOVERNOR WILSON -- I DON'T RECEIVE THESE
07 LETTERS VERY OFTEN, SO I FEEL PRETTY PROUD ABOUT THIS
08 ONE. AFTER A PARAGRAPH IN WHICH HE BASICALLY THANKS US
09 FOR OUR SERVICE, HE SAYS:
10 "TO ENSURE TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION
11 OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK, I'VE SIGNED
12 EXECUTIVE ORDER W-137-96 INSTRUCTING
13 ALL CAL/E.P.A. BOARDS, OFFICES AND
14 DEPARTMENTS TO DEVELOP PLANS FOR
15 ADDRESSING THE COMMITTEE'S
16 RECOMMENDATIONS AS PART OF THEIR
17 STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE
18 NEXT FISCAL YEAR.
19 "I'VE ALSO CALLED ON SECRETARY
20 STROCK TO CONVENE A TASK FORCE OF
21 DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY HEADS WITHIN
22 CALIFORNIA STATE GOVERNMENT TO IDENTIFY
23 ADDITIONAL STATE AGENCIES THAT PERFORM
24 ACTIVITIES INVOLVING CHEMICAL RISK
25 ASSESSMENT IN THE ENVIRONMENT AND THEN
0008
01 THESE ADDITIONAL AGENCIES WILL DEVELOP
02 IMPLEMENTATION PLANS AND WILL BE ASKED

03 TO WORK WITH CAL/E.P.A. IN UNIFYING
04 AND IMPROVING THE RISK ASSESSMENT
05 PRACTICES."
06 AND HE SAYS:
07 "I'VE DESIGNATED CAL/E.P.A.'S
08 O.E.H.H.A. AS THE PRINCIPAL STATE
09 AGENCY FOR COORDINATION OF THIS
10 COORDINATED EFFORT."
11 AND THEN FINALLY -- I THINK THIS IS REALLY
12 IMPORTANT. IT'S A SIGNAL.
13 "IT HAS BEEN A LONGSTANDING
14 GOAL OF MY ADMINISTRATION TO
15 MAINTAIN CALIFORNIA'S HIGH
16 ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS BY APPLYING
17 THE BEST AVAILABLE SCIENCE IN AN
18 OBJECTIVE AND CONSISTENT FASHION."
19 I THINK WE CAN ALL ACCEPT AND LISTEN TO THAT
20 SENTENCE FROM THE GOVERNOR.
21 "CAREFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
22 COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION WILL CLEARLY
23 MOVE US CLOSER TO THAT GOAL AND I WANT
24 TO THANK YOU AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE
25 COMMITTEE THAT HELP KEEP CALIFORNIA ON
0009
01 THE CUTTING EDGE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
02 SCIENCE. SINCERELY, PETE WILSON."
03 SO WE'RE QUITE PLEASED THAT THE EXECUTIVE
04 ORDER WAS SIGNED, AND WHAT I THINK THIS MEANS IS THAT THE
05 ADMINISTRATION WANTS TO MOVE AGGRESSIVELY ON
06 IMPLEMENTATION -- THAT'S FAIRLY CLEAR-CUT -- AND ALSO THAT
07 THE ADMINISTRATION WILL SUPPORT A LOT OF THE THINGS THAT
08 WE ESPOUSE AS A SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL IN TIMELY PEER
09 REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC REVIEW OF THE DOCUMENTS, WHICH OF
10 COURSE IS WHAT THIS PANEL IS ALL ABOUT.
11 IT'S ACTUALLY PIONEERED AND SHOWN THE WAY IN
12 WHICH IT OUGHT TO BE DONE, AND SO I APPLAUD THE S.R.P.
13 MODEL AND WE CERTAINLY USED IT FREQUENTLY WHEN WE WERE
14 DELIBERATING IN CONNECTION WITH THE RISK ASSESSMENT
15 ADVISORY COMMITTEE. I THINK IT MEANS CONSISTENCY.
16 THERE WILL BE A LOT MORE TALK ABOUT
17 CONSISTENCY WITHIN THE BOARDS AND DEPARTMENTS OF STATE
18 GOVERNMENT. THERE WILL BE MORE TALK ABOUT HARMONIZATION,
19 FEDERAL AND STATE, AND FINALLY BETTER SCIENCE IS RAMPANT
20 IN THE DOCUMENT AND ONE OF THE MANY RECOMMENDATIONS, FOR
21 EXAMPLE, IS TO SUPPORT THE STAFF OF THE A.R.B. AND
22 O.E.H.H.A. AND OTHER GROUPS THAT DO ASSESSMENT TO KEEP UP
23 WITH THE SCIENCE, PARTICIPATE IN PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS,
24 AND GENERALLY STAY ON TOP OF WHAT OF COURSE IS AN
25 INCREASINGLY COMPLICATED WORLD.
0010
01 BUT ONE LAST COMMENT IS WE'RE BLESSED WITH A
02 TREMENDOUS STAFF IN STATE GOVERNMENT. NOT ONLY ARE THEY
03 VERY GOOD, BUT THEY HAVE CONTINUITY. MANY OF THESE FOLKS
04 HAVE BEEN WITH US FOR -- PEOPLE LIKE JAMES AND PEOPLE LIKE
05 GEORGE AND JOAN AND ALL THE OTHER FOLKS OUT HERE -- MANY
06 YEARS, SO WE HAVE A TREMENDOUS CONTINUITY THAT OUR FEDERAL
07 COUNTERPARTS DON'T OFTEN HAVE. SO ALL THESE THINGS ARE

08 VERY POSITIVE.
09 AND ANYWAY, THAT'S THE ANNOUNCEMENT, JIM.
10 DR. PITTS: WELL, GREAT. I CONGRATULATE YOU, JIM,
11 AND MEMBERS OF THE YOUR RISK ASSESSMENT ADVISORY
12 COMMITTEE. PERHAPS I'D SUGGEST INFORMALLY OR FORMALLY,
13 WOULD YOU CONVEY OUR CONGRATULATIONS NOT ONLY TO YOURSELF,
14 AS A VITAL COMMITTEE PERSON, BUT ALSO AS AN S.R.P.
15 WE CONGRATULATE THEM ON THIS, THEIR PRODUCT,
16 AND THEN ALSO OUR APPRECIATION CERTAINLY AT THIS -- THAT
17 IT'S BEING IMPLEMENTED THROUGH THE APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS.
18 DR. SEIBER: WILL DO.
19 DR. PITTS: ARE THERE ANY -- IS THERE ANY
20 DISCUSSION OF THIS? ANY OTHER DISCUSSION OF THIS
21 PARTICULAR BUSINESS?
22 OKAY. IF THERE'S NOT, THEN WE'LL MOVE AHEAD
23 TO THE FIRST ITEM OF TODAY'S AGENDA, UPDATE FROM THE
24 DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION'S ASSESSMENT PROGRAM.
25 THIS WILL INVOLVE TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT DOCUMENTS AND
0011
01 TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT CANDIDATE DOCUMENTS, AND THIS WILL
02 BE ADDRESSED -- LED, THE DISCUSSION, BY DR. PAUL GOSSELIN.
03 PAUL?
04 MR. GOSSELIN: THANK YOU. AND ACTUALLY, I'M NOT A
05 DOCTOR, BUT I APPRECIATE THAT.
06 JEAN-MARI PELTIER, CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR,
07 WANTED TO BE HERE TODAY. SHE GOT CALLED AWAY ON SOMETHING
08 ELSE AND -- BUT SHE IS PLANNING ON ATTENDING THE NEXT
09 MEETING NEXT TIME WE'RE COMING HERE TO PRESENT SOMETHING,
10 BUT TODAY -- ACTUALLY, WE WERE SCHEDULED TO COME AND
11 ADDRESS THE PANEL IN OCTOBER AND BECAUSE OF OTHER ITEMS
12 HAD TO MOVE THAT AND ONE OF THE ITEMS WAS DISCUSSION ON
13 METHYL BROMIDE, THE MONITORING AND MODELING METHODOLOGIES
14 THAT WE UTILIZED.
15 UNFORTUNATELY, WE'RE NOT ABLE TO TALK ABOUT
16 THAT TODAY. I HAVE NUMEROUS STAFF OUT IN THE FIELD DOING
17 ADDITIONAL MONITORING SURVEILLANCE WORK TO FURTHER VERIFY
18 OUR MONITORING AND THIS IS AN ISSUE WE CAN BRING BACK UP
19 AT SOME FUTURE MEETING WHENEVER YOU DESIRE.
20 BUT TODAY WE ACTUALLY HAVE TWO PRETTY TIMELY
21 AND PRETTY GOOD TOPICS TO PRESENT AND THEY BOTH DEAL WITH
22 ONE, I THINK, SUCCESSFUL ASPECT OF THE WAY THE DEPARTMENT
23 OF PESTICIDE REGULATION HAS BEEN HANDLING THE 1807
24 PROGRAM; AND THAT'S DEALING WITH HOW DO WE CHOOSE WHICH --
25 OF THE HUNDREDS OF PESTICIDES REGISTERED, WHICH ONES TO
0012
01 MONITOR FOR? WHICH ONES SHOULD WE REALLY SPEND OUR
02 RESOURCES AND GO OUT AND LOOK FOR IN TRYING TO FIND THE
03 WORST ACTORS?
04 AND SECONDLY, WORKING WITH A.R.B., A.R.B.
05 PRINCIPALLY DOES THE AIR MONITORING FOR US. WHAT HAS THAT
06 MONITORING SHOWED? AND I THINK NOW WE'RE UP OVER TO CLOSE
07 TO 25 COMPOUNDS THAT WE ACTUALLY HAVE FULL SETS OF
08 MONITORING DATA ON THAT, AND WE'RE GOING TO HAVE
09 PRESENTATIONS ON BOTH THOSE TOPICS; BUT FIRST, I THINK ONE
10 THING THAT I DID WANT TO NOTE IS THE STATUS OF THE
11 DOCUMENTS.
12 WE HAVE ACTUALLY SET UP -- AND I THINK

13 THROUGHOUT STATE GOVERNMENT WE'RE GETTING INTO MORE, BEING
14 MORE SPECIFIC ON PERFORMANCE GOALS AND MEASURES, AND ONE
15 THING WITH THIS PROGRAM WE'RE LOOKING TO DO IS TO HAVE
16 COMPLETION OF THREE T.A.C. DOCUMENTS IN EACH YEAR, SO
17 YOU'LL BE SEEING COMPLETION OF ONE DOCUMENT IN THIS NEXT
18 CALENDAR YEAR AND YOU'LL BE SEEING DRAFTS OF THE T.A.C.
19 DOCUMENTS FOR E.R. REVIEW ON THE SCIENCE AND HOW THAT WAS
20 PUT TOGETHER.
21 IN JANUARY OR FEBRUARY, YOU'LL SEE THE FIRST
22 DRAFT ON D.E.F. IN SPRING/MARCH, YOU'LL SEE ONE ON
23 METAM-SODIUM, AND THEN LATER IN THE YEAR YOU'LL SEE
24 AZINPHOS-METHYL GLUTATHIONE. SO WITH THAT, IF THERE
25 AREN'T ANY OTHER QUESTIONS, WE'LL MOVE RIGHT INTO --
0013
01 DR. FROINES: WHAT WERE THOSE THREE AGAIN?
02 METAM-SODIUM, I GOT.
03 MR. GOSSELIN: METAM-SODIUM. D.E.F., WHICH IS
04 DEPARTMENT DEFOLIANT.
05 DR. FROINES: AND WHAT'S THE THIRD?
06 MR. GOSSELIN: AZINPHOS-METHYL.
07 DR. PITTS: AZINPHOS-METHYL.
08 DR. FROINES: WHERE IS THAT IN THIS TABLE?
09 DR. PITTS: YEAH. LET'S JUST PAUSE A MOMENT. WE
10 WILL --
11 MR. GOSSELIN: WE --
12 DR. PITTS: FOR THE AUDIENCE HERE --
13 MR. GOSSELIN: IT'S ON PAGE 15.
14 DR. PITTS: -- WE HAVE A COPY OF THE REPORT HERE.
15 IT SAYS, "PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION AS CANDIDATE TOXIC AIR
16 CONTAMINANTS." IT IS DATED OCTOBER 1996, PUT OUT BY
17 D.P.R., AND THIS IS THE GAME PLAN IN THE SENSE THAT YOU
18 ARE PRESENTING AND HAVE DEVELOPED -- YOUR GROUP HAS
19 DEVELOPED. SO THAT'S FOR THE AUDIENCE'S INTERESTS.
20 MR. KELLEY: YEAH. WE HAVE SEVERAL COPIES.
21 DR. PITTS: GO AHEAD. I JUST WANTED TO MAKE THAT
22 CLEAR.
23 MR. GOSSELIN: I THINK LEADING INTO THAT DOCUMENT,
24 THIS DOES LAY OUT, AT LEAST AS WE'RE SITTING HERE IN 1996,
25 THE GAME PLAN WE HAVE ON HOW TO PRIORITIZE THE COMPOUNDS,
0014
01 THE SAID COMPOUNDS, AND THIS THING IS A LIVING DOCUMENT.
02 WE'RE NOT BEHOLDEN TO EXACTLY THE LIST AS IT'S PRESENTED;
03 BUT WE'VE ALSO GOTTEN SOME GOOD REQUESTS FROM A.R.B. OR
04 COUNTY HEALTH OFFICES OR OTHER HEALTH OFFICIALS ON WANTING
05 US TO STOP MONITORING DIFFERENT PESTICIDES, AND THAT CAN
06 ALSO BE FACTORED INTO PRIORITY AND HOW MUCH RESOURCES WE
07 HAVE.
08 SO AS PESTICIDE USE CHANGES AND DIFFERENT
09 PRACTICES COME IN AND OUT, WE HAVE TO BE FLEXIBLE ON HOW
10 WE GO FORWARD AND PICK WHICH COMPOUNDS TO MONITOR FROM.
11 I THINK ALL THAT IS WHAT I JUST -- JUST EXPLAINED ABOUT
12 DOCUMENTS COMING THROUGH.
13 WHAT THIS DOCUMENT PRESENTS IS UP FRONT
14 TRYING TO GET THE DATA ON THE EXPOSURE FROM THOSE
15 COMPOUNDS. THAT THEN FEEDS INTO THE RISK ASSESSMENT ON
16 WHAT THOSE EXPOSURES LEAD INTO IN OUR RISK ASSESSMENT
17 PROCESS, WHICH IS A WHOLE SEPARATE TIERED PROGRAM. AND

18 TYING BACK INTO WHAT DR. SEIBER WORKED ON, ALL OF THIS IS
19 UNDER EXTENSIVE REVIEW AND MODIFICATION ON HOW WE CONDUCT
20 THE RISK ASSESSMENT AND HOW WE PRIORITIZE WHICH COMPOUNDS
21 COME THROUGH.
22 SO I THINK THIS IS GOING TO BE A MAJOR --
23 MAYBE A YEAR OF CHANGE ON HOW THAT'S CONDUCTED, BUT WE
24 ALSO ARE KEEPING TRACK OF -- WE HAVE A FAIRLY HEALTHY
25 BACKLOG OF MATERIALS FOR WHICH WE HAVE DATA ON THAT THEY
0015
01 NEED TO BRING CLOSURE TO AND THAT'S SOMETHING WE'RE GOING
02 TO WORK ON.
03 BUT ALSO AS AN ASIDE TO THAT, WE HAVE BEEN
04 ABLE TO -- WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO TAKE REGULATORY STEPS
05 IMMEDIATELY, IF NEED BE, ON THE COMPOUNDS WHEN WE DO GET
06 DATA IN, AND METAM-SODIUM IS A CLEAR EXAMPLE ON THAT.
07 WHEN WE GOT DATA IN FROM A.R.B. ON THE
08 METAM-SODIUM MONITORING, WE IMMEDIATELY WENT TO EMERGENCY
09 REGULATIONS AND MADE IT A RESTRICTED MATERIAL SUBJECT TO A
10 COUNTY PERMIT AND PUT IN A SERIES OF RESTRICTIONS ON THE
11 USE OF METAM-SODIUM, INCLUDING SETTING BUFFER ZONES,
12 TEMPERATURE LIMITATIONS, USE-RATE LIMITATIONS AND ALSO
13 SOME CONDITIONS LIKE THAT.
14 D.E.F. ALSO HAS HAD RESTRICTIONS ON THE BOOKS
15 FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS, REGULATIONS, BUFFER ZONES IN
16 SCHOOLS, HOMES AND WHATNOT.
17 BUT WITH THAT, ONE OF THE THINGS WE WANTED TO
18 DO, AGAIN, WAS TAKE A LOOK AT THE PESTICIDE PRODUCTS -- WE
19 HAVE PRIORITIZED THE RISK ASSESSMENT -- AND TAKE A LOOK AT
20 THE SCIENCE AND THE BEST WAY TO PRIORITIZE WHICH COMPOUNDS
21 WE NEED TO MONITOR, AND THAT WAS THE SUBJECT OF THE REPORT
22 THAT WAS OFFERED FOR YOUR REVIEW.
23 MR. KELLEY: GOOD MORNING, DR. PITTS AND MEMBERS OF
24 THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL. MY NAME IS KEVIN KELLEY.
25 IT'S K-E-L-L-E-Y. AND BASICALLY I'M HERE TO DO A SHORT
0016
01 PRESENTATION TO YOU THIS MORNING ON OUR "PESTICIDES FOR
02 EVALUATION AS CANDIDATE TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS" DOCUMENT.
03 YOU'VE SEEN THIS REPORT BEFORE AND MADE
04 COMMENTS ON IT. WE INCORPORATED THOSE COMMENTS INTO OUR
05 DOCUMENT. MY PRESENTATION THIS MORNING WILL BE TO -- I'LL
06 GO THROUGH YOUR COMMENTS IN A BRIEF FORUM AND TO EXPLAIN
07 HOW WE'VE ADDRESSED THEM.
08 FIRST OF ALL, THERE WERE THREE MAJOR AREAS
09 THAT YOU HAD SUGGESTED COMMENTS IN THE DOCUMENT. THE
10 FIRST WAS ON THE FORMAT, THE SECOND PART WAS ON TOXICOLOGY
11 SECTION AND THE THIRD PART WAS ON PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL
12 CHARACTERISTICS.
13 IN OUR ORIGINAL REPORT, WE HAD PESTICIDES
14 SEGREGATED TO THREE PRIORITY CATEGORIES -- HIGH, MEDIUM
15 AND LOW -- BASED ON THEIR RELATIVE RANKINGS. YOU ASKED
16 WHY WE HAD DONE THIS AND HOW IT WOULD AFFECT D.P.R.'S
17 ACTIONS TOWARD EVALUATING THESE CHEMICALS.
18 DESIGNATIONS OF THE THREE PRIORITY CATEGORIES
19 WAS ARBITRARY AND IT WAS DONE TO PROVIDE THE READER WITH
20 READER TABLES OF A MANAGEABLE SIZE, ABOUT 30 TO 40
21 PESTICIDES EACH. WITH RESPECT TO THE EVALUATION PROCESS,
22 PESTICIDES OF A HIGHER RANK ARE THOSE WHICH HAVE BEEN

23 EVALUATED BEFORE THOSE OF THE LOWER RANK.
24 IN OUR FINAL REPORT BEFORE YOU NOW, WE'VE
25 ABANDONED THE ARBITRATED VISION OF PESTICIDES IN THE
0017
01 PRIORITY GROUPS; AND INSTEAD, WHAT WE'VE DONE, WHICH IS
02 BASICALLY ON PAGE 14 OF THE DOCUMENT, IS WE'VE PRESENTED
03 YOU WITH ONE TABLE OF CANDIDATE PESTICIDES AND HAVE
04 APPOINTED SUMS FOR EACH CATEGORY AND THEIR RELATIVE
05 RANKING. THE PESTICIDES IN THE DOCUMENT WERE RANKED BY
06 THE TOTAL POINTS AND THEN BY THEIR TOTAL TOXICITY SCORE
07 AND THEN FINALLY BY ITS USE OR SALES INFORMATION.
08 OUR PLAN TO EVALUATE THESE PESTICIDES REMAINS
09 THE SAME. WE WILL EVALUATE THEM IN THE ORDER OF THEIR
10 RELATIVE RANKING.
11 WE'VE ALSO ADDED TO THIS DOCUMENT AN
12 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND A TABLE OUTLINING THE STATUS OF THE
13 S.B. 950 AND PROP 65 COMPOUNDS WITH RESPECT TO MONITORING
14 INFORMATION THAT WE'VE RECEIVED FROM A.R.B. OR -- AND
15 THEIR STATUS AS WHETHER THEY'RE TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS
16 OR -- THERE HAS TO BE A CERTAIN LEVEL OF TOXIC AIR
17 CONTAMINANTS.
18 WE'VE ALSO ADDED A GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND
19 ABBREVIATIONS TO THE DOCUMENT AND A SECTION WHICH EXPLAINS
20 THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT.
21 SECONDLY, THE CHANGES IN THE TOXICOLOGY
22 SECTION, ONE OF YOUR SUGGESTIONS WAS TO ELIMINATE THE PROP
23 65 CRITERION AS A CRITERION, SIMPLY BECAUSE THE ASSUMPTION
24 WAS IF IT WASN'T LISTED FOR POINTS IN THE PROP 65, ONE
25 COULD ASSUME THAT IT HAD NO ONCOGENICITY OR NO PROBLEMS
0018
01 WITH THAT.
02 DR. FROINES: I'M SORRY. I MISSED SOMETHING. YOU
03 SAID IT WAS OUR SUGGESTION --
04 DR. PITTS: WHEN HE WENT UP TO JOIN YOU PEOPLE, THE
05 THREE OF US. JIM, YOU AND --
06 DR. FROINES: -- FOR THE E.P.A.?
07 MR. KELLEY: IT WAS ALSO IN THE LAST S.R.P., WHICH
08 WE PRESENTED THE CANDIDATE REPORT TO YOU AS A DRAFT FORM.
09 DR. FROINES: THANK YOU. I WASN'T PART OF THAT
10 MEETING, I THINK.
11 MR. GOSSELIN: I THINK THE REASON WHY WAS THAT
12 THERE WAS A NUMBER OF OTHER CRITERIA ALREADY IN PLACE TO
13 ADDRESS REPRODUCTIVE OR SOME CHRONIC HEALTH EFFECT THAT
14 SORT OF COVERED THAT ISSUE. I THINK THAT WAS THE REASON
15 WHY.
16 MR. KELLEY: ALSO, THERE WERE, I THINK, ONLY FIVE
17 OR SIX PESTICIDES THAT ACTUALLY GOT POINTS FOR THE PROP
18 65, SO IT DIDN'T REALLY HELP MUCH.
19 DR. FROINES: I DON'T AGREE WITH YOU. I THINK
20 IF -- I THINK THAT IF I REMEMBER ANY OF THE DISCUSSION
21 WHEN WE WERE UP THERE, WE THOUGHT THAT ONE OF THE REASONS
22 THAT PROP 65 WASN'T NECESSARILY APPROPRIATE WAS THAT
23 PROP 65 FOR THE MOST PART DRAWS ITS CHEMICALS FROM
24 EXISTING LISTS.
25 NOW, THERE ARE SOME THAT GO BEYOND THE
0019
01 EXISTING LISTS, BUT MOST OF THEM COME FROM, QUOTE,

02 "AUTHORITATIVE" SOURCES; BUT THAT AUTHORITATIVE SOURCES
03 INCLUDES A LARGE NUMBER OF AGENCIES, INCLUDING I.A.R.C.,
04 FOR EXAMPLE. BUT I THINK ONE OF THE PROBLEMS WITH WHAT
05 YOU'VE BASED IT ON N.T.P., E.P.A. AND N.P.A., WHICH IS A
06 VERY SMALL UNIVERSE. I.A.R.C. IS A LARGER UNIVERSE.
07 AND SO THE QUESTION -- AN IMPORTANT QUESTION
08 WHICH I THINK I WANT TO DISCUSS WITH YOU IS WHY NARROW THE
09 SCOPE OF THE CARCINOGENICITY DATA AND NOT ONLY IN TERMS OF
10 THE AGENCY, BUT IN TERMS OF THE SCOPE OF THE INFORMATION
11 THAT'S USED.
12 FOR EXAMPLE, I.A.R.C. IN THE EARLY '90'S
13 CHANGED THEIR METHOD OF EVALUATION OF CARCINOGENS TO
14 INCLUDE OTHER RELATIVE DATA, OTHER SCIENTIFIC DATA. YOU
15 DON'T INCLUDE ANY OF THOSE CONSIDERATIONS IN HERE. YOU
16 ARE BASICALLY DRIVEN BY A REGULATORY VIEW OF IT, AS
17 OPPOSED TO A SCIENTIFIC VIEW, AND I THINK THAT'S NOT IN
18 KEEPING WITH THE WAY WE HISTORICALLY HAVE DEALT WITH
19 CHEMICALS IN THIS GROUP OR IN UNDER THE CARCINOGENIC
20 IDENTIFICATION COMMITTEE IN PROP 65; AND THAT IS THAT I
21 WOULD RATHER THAT YOU USE THE I.A.R.C. CRITERION FOR
22 CHARACTERIZATION OF CARCINOGENICITY THAN USING WHAT
23 FEDERAL E.P.A. HAS DONE, BECAUSE FEDERAL E.P.A. IS
24 NOTORIOUSLY LIMITED IN TERMS OF THEIR CARCINOGENICITY
25 CHARACTERIZATION, WHEREAS I.A.R.C., WHATEVER ITS STRENGTHS
0020
01 AND WEAKNESSES, IS STILL THE BEST OUT THERE AND THEIR
02 CRITERION STILL REPRESENTS THE BEST -- I THINK THE BEST
03 WAY OF APPROACHING THESE KINDS OF ISSUES, BUT WE CAN TALK
04 ABOUT IT AS YOU GO ALONG. I DON'T WANT TO INTERRUPT FOR
05 TOO LONG.
06 MR. KELLEY: THANK YOU. WE ARE STILL KEEPING --
07 DR. PITTS: EXCUSE ME. WE'LL COME BACK TO THAT
08 WHEN WE OPEN IT FOR GENERAL DISCUSSION.
09 MR. KELLEY: THANK YOU. WE WILL STILL BE KEEPING
10 THE PROP 65 LISTING OF CHEMICALS AS A SOURCE JUST LIKE WE
11 USE THE S.B. 950 AS A SOURCE OF OUR CHEMICALS THAT WE'RE
12 EVALUATING IN THE RANKING PROCESS. WE DID ADD THE N.T.S.
13 (SIC) INFORMATION. WE ADDED THE N.T.S. INFORMATION IN THE
14 TOXICOLOGY/ONCOLOGY DATA AND I THOUGHT THAT THAT IS WHAT
15 WE HAD DISCUSSED LAST TIME ABOUT THAT. WE CAN GO ON TO
16 THAT IF WE NEED TO.
17 DR. FRIEDMAN: EXCUSE ME. WHAT DOES N.T.S. MEAN?
18 MR. KELLEY: IT'S THE NATIONAL -- EXCUSE ME.
19 N.T.P. IT'S THE NATIONAL TOXICOLOGY PROGRAM.
20 DR. FROINES: THE NATIONAL TOXICOLOGY PROGRAM OF
21 THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENT HEALTH SCIENCES MADE
22 UP OF THE VARIOUS FEDERAL AGENCIES THAT DEAL WITH
23 CARCINOGENICITY PRIMARILY.
24 MR. KELLEY: SINCE THAT'S WHERE WE'RE AT WITH THE
25 TWO OF THOSE, IF THERE ARE OVERLAPS WHERE ONE LISTED A
0021
01 PESTICIDE OF HIGH CARCINOGENICITY, THEN WE USED WHICHEVER
02 WOULD BE THE MOST CONSERVATIVE EITHER FROM THE U.S. E.P.A.
03 OR THE N.T.P. ASSESSMENT. AND FINALLY, WE MADE CHANGES IN
04 THE PHYSICAL/CHEMICAL CHARACTERISTICS SECTION OF THE
05 REPORT AND WE EXPANDED THE DISCUSSION OF HENRY'S LAW
06 CONSTANT AND WE'VE ADDED SECTIONS DISCUSSING APPLICATION

07 METHOD, PHYSICAL STATE OR WATER SOLUBILITY.
08 UNFORTUNATELY, IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, THESE
09 THREE CRITERIA DID NOT PROVE USEFUL IN THE APPLICATION OF
10 PESTICIDES. THE APPLICATION METHOD PROVED NOT USEFUL TO
11 ALMOST 80 PERCENT OF PESTICIDES AND MAY BE APPLIED BY AIR
12 OR THEY ARE SOIL FUMIGANTS AND ARE VERY VOLATILE, AND
13 THESE WOULD HAVE RECEIVED FOUR POINTS AND JUST BOOSTED THE
14 POINTS OF THE CRITERION WITHOUT PROVIDING ANY REAL
15 RESOLUTION.
16 PHYSICAL STATE WAS NOT USEFUL BECAUSE THE
17 RESULTS MIRRORED THOSE FROM VOLATILITY. AND ALSO FINALLY,
18 WATER SOLUBILITY IS A COMPONENT OF HENRY'S LAW CONSTANT
19 AND SORT OF MADE THAT REDUNDANT.
20 BASICALLY, THAT'S IT. I'M OPEN FOR
21 QUESTIONS.
22 DR. PITTS: ALL RIGHT. LET'S START OFF WITH JIM.
23 DR. SEIBER, WOULD YOU --
24 DR. SEIBER: YEAH. I HAVE A QUESTION ABOUT -- I
25 GUESS IT RELATES MOST TO APPLICATION METHOD, AND IT SEEMS
0022
01 TO ME WHEN I LOOKED AT THE CRITERION, AND THE LAST -- AND
02 BY THE WAY, THIS IS MUCH IMPROVED. THIS IS SOMETHING YOU
03 CAN FOLLOW, CERTAINLY A BIG IMPROVEMENT OVER BEFORE, SO I
04 APPLAUD YOU FOR THE EFFORT IN THAT REGARD.
05 BUT A LOT OF THE EMPHASIS IS PLACED ON
06 VOLATILITY, WILL THE CHEMICAL LIFT OFF FROM THE SURFACE
07 AND GET IN THE AIR, WHICH OF COURSE IS IMPORTANT; BUT
08 THERE'S ALSO THIS BIG COMPONENT OF DRIFT. WHEN THE
09 CHEMICAL IS APPLIED, SOMEHOW IT DRIFTS AWAY AND IT'S
10 ALMOST IMMATERIAL WHAT THE PHYSICAL PROPERTIES ARE. SO I
11 WAS WONDERING HOW YOU DEAL WITH DRIFT DURING APPLICATION,
12 AS OPPOSED TO POST-APPLICATION LIFTOFF FROM THE SURFACE?
13 MR. GOSSELIN: YEAH. AND THAT'S A VERY
14 IMPORTANT -- A VERY IMPORTANT POINT, THE DIFFERENCE
15 BETWEEN DRIFT AND SORT OF THIS OFF-SITE MOVEMENT AS WE'RE
16 DEALING WITH THE T.A.C. PROGRAM, BECAUSE WE'RE DEALING
17 WITH THE AMBIENT CONCENTRATIONS IN COMMUNITIES, HUMAN
18 EXPOSURE OR PEOPLE, NOT PART OF THE APPLICATION PROCESS
19 FROM LEGAL APPLICATIONS.
20 THE WAY WE VIEW DRIFT, DRIFT IS AN
21 ENFORCEABLE STANDARD ABOUT KEEPING THE MATERIAL ON-SITE SO
22 THAT NO DAMAGE OR HARM IS DONE AS SORT OF OUR COURSE OF
23 APPLICATION AND, YOU KNOW, THIS HAS BEEN A BIG YEAR WITH
24 DRIFT NOT JUST BECAUSE OF A COUPLE OF BIG INCIDENTS WE'VE
25 HAD, BUT THERE HAVE BEEN A LOT OF OTHER INCIDENTS THAT
0023
01 HAVE GONE ON THAT WE'VE BEEN TAKING A LOOK BACK AT THE
02 REGULATORY STANDARDS THAT WE HAVE ON REGULATING DRIFT.
03 SO IF IT'S A MATTER THAT THE WEATHER
04 CONDITIONS ARE NOT RIGHT OR SOMEONE MAKES POOR JUDGMENT OR
05 THEY'RE NOT EXERCISING THE JUDGMENT THAT'S GIVEN THEM, AT
06 LEAST THE BOTTOM LINE IS GOING TO BE THAT THEY'RE GOING TO
07 GET HIT WITH THE ENFORCING PENALTIES AND/OR WE NEED TO
08 CHANGE AND BE A BIT MORE PRESCRIPTIVE ON THE REGULATORY
09 STANDARDS WE HAVE ON THE BOOKS.
10 DR. SEIBER: BUT IN A WAY BOTH OF THEM CONTRIBUTE
11 TO WHAT'S IN THE AIR.

12 MR. GOSSELIN: RIGHT.
13 DR. SEIBER: SO FROM A TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT POINT
14 OF VIEW, YOU WOULDN'T KNOW WITH A RESIDUE YOU SEE TEN
15 MILES AWAY WHETHER IT CAME FROM DRIFT OR POST-APPLICATION
16 LIFTOFF. IT SEEMS TO ME THEY BOTH ARE CONSIDERATIONS AND
17 I THINK KEVIN POINTED OUT THAT 80 PERCENT ARE APPLIED BY
18 AIR. I KNOW THAT'S THE CASE, SO THAT'S A TREMENDOUS
19 OPPORTUNITY FOR DRIFT.
20 MR. GOSSELIN: AND -- WELL, I THINK AND I THINK
21 IT'S -- WE AND U.S. E.P.A. HAVE BEEN LOOKING AT DRIFT, THE
22 AERIAL APPLICATORS' ASSOCIATION WILL ARGUE BACK TO GROUND
23 APPLICATIONS AS BEING A MAJOR COMPONENT. THEY'RE STARTING
24 THIS BATTLE GOING ON, REVIEWING THE SCIENCE.
25 BUT AGAIN, I THINK, YOU KNOW, DRIFT IS
0024
01 PREDOMINANTLY CAUSED BY AERIAL APPLICATION. ONE OF THE
02 DOWNSIDES TO HAVING THAT AS A CRITERION PESTICIDE LABELS
03 KEEP CHANGING OFF AND ON AND THEY'LL TAKE AND ADD ON
04 METHODS OF APPLICATION ON COMPOUNDS AND THAT DOES KIND OF
05 MAKE IT SOMEWHAT OF A MOVING TARGET.
06 AND SECONDLY, ALSO, I THINK THAT WE HAVE TO
07 ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE BIGGEST EXPOSURE PROBLEMS AS FAR AS
08 APPLICATIONS HAVE BEEN FROM SOIL FUMIGANTS AND EVEN
09 METAM-SODIUM WITH SPRINKLER APPLICATIONS. THOSE HAVE
10 RESULTED IN THE MOST SERIOUS EXPOSURE PROBLEMS THAT WE'VE
11 RUN INTO, BUT OBVIOUSLY DRIFT FROM AERIAL APPLICATION IS
12 AT THE TOP OF THE LINE.
13 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, SO THIS -- FOR THOSE OF US WHO
14 ARE VERY LONG-TERM MEMBERS OF THIS PANEL, I REMEMBER A
15 LENGTHY DISCUSSION ABOUT DRIFT IN SAN DIEGO A THOUSAND
16 YEARS AGO. SO BOTTOM LINE IS ARE YOU GOING TO INCLUDE IT
17 IN YOUR ASSESSMENT AND YOUR PRIORITIZATION? BECAUSE IT
18 HAPPENS.
19 I MEAN, I AGREE WITH YOU THAT IF EVERYTHING
20 IS DONE ACCORDING TO HOYLE IT SHOULDN'T HAPPEN AND THAT
21 YOU SHOULD, YOU KNOW, APPLAUD THAT THERE ARE APPROPRIATE
22 ENFORCEMENT THINGS THAT YOU CAN AND SHOULD DO; BUT THE
23 FACT IS IT DOES HAPPEN.
24 I MEAN, SHOULDN'T THAT BE INCLUDED IN YOUR
25 ASSESSMENT THE FACT THAT THERE'S A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF
0025
01 MISAPPLICATION AND DRIFT AND THINGS LIKE THAT? BECAUSE
02 THOSE ARE GOING TO AFFECT THE EXPOSURES THE PUBLIC SEES.
03 EVEN THOUGH THEY'RE NOT SUPPOSED TO DO IT THAT WAY, IT'S
04 THERE.
05 MR. GOSSELIN: TO SOME EXTENT, IF A -- AGAIN, FOR
06 THIS RANKING SYSTEM, FOR US TO BE ABLE TO CHOOSE WHICH
07 COMPOUND WE NEED TO GO AFTER AND TACKLE, THE METHOD OF
08 APPLICATION IS GOING TO BE A FACTOR, IN THAT WHEN WE TAKE
09 A LOOK AT THE PRACTICES AND TRY TO DECIDE, IT'S SORT OF
10 THE WORST CASE USE PRACTICE, WORST CASE LOCATIONS TO GO
11 OUT AND MONITOR FOR.
12 ALL THAT BEING SAID, I DO THINK WE TAKE THAT
13 INTO ACCOUNT; BUT I THINK WE MIGHT BE GOING DOWN A
14 SLIPPERY PATH IF WE SIT BACK AND ACKNOWLEDGE THAT DRIFT IS
15 GOING TO HAPPEN AND PEOPLE ARE GOING TO GET EXPOSED
16 BECAUSE DRIFT IS THERE, BECAUSE I PERSONALLY FEEL THAT,

17 YOU KNOW, WE SHOULDN'T ACCEPT THAT AND WE SHOULDN'T ACCEPT
18 PEOPLE MAKING POOR JUDGMENTS AND HAVING DRIFT GO ON.
19 EVEN THOUGH IT DOES, I THINK WE NEED TO BEEF
20 UP THE CONTROLS WE HAVE ON REGULATING DRIFT AND BEEF UP
21 THE ENFORCEMENT ON IT AND HOW WE REGULATE THAT TO KIND OF
22 HOLD UP A FRONT LINE AND SEND A CLEAR MESSAGE THAT, YOU
23 KNOW, LARGE AMOUNTS OF DRIFTS IS UNACCEPTABLE.
24 BUT I THINK WHEN WE GO IN AND MONITOR LOOKING
25 AT THE WORST APPLICATION PRACTICE OF THOSE MATERIALS,
0026
01 WHETHER IT'S AN AERIAL APPLICATION OR WHETHER IT'S A POWER
02 MIST BLOWER REALLY NEEDS TO BE LOOKED AT AS TO WHAT'S
03 COMING OFF SITE AND WHAT ARE PEOPLE GOING TO BE EXPOSED
04 TO, EVEN UNDER WHAT'S THE CURRENT LEGAL ALLOWABLE
05 PRACTICE.
06 DR. FRIEDMAN: QUESTION, IS THERE A LOT OF
07 VARIATION AMONG THESE COMPOUNDS IN THE DEGREE OF DRIFT
08 THAT OCCURS GIVEN A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF APPLICATION?
09 MR. GOSSELIN: YEAH. AND I THINK THAT THERE WAS
10 AN -- THE INDUSTRY PUT TOGETHER A SPRAY DRIFT TASK FORCE
11 TO PROVIDE U.S. E.P.A. DATA ON SPRAY DRIFT, AND THIS GOES
12 BACK A NUMBER OF YEARS, BECAUSE E.P.A. WAS LOOKING FOR
13 SPECIFIC DATA OR THEY WERE GOING TO HOLD UP PRODUCTS --
14 REGISTRATION OF PRODUCTS AND THE INDUSTRY CAME THROUGH.
15 ONE OF THE THINGS THAT THEY CAME DOWN TO IS
16 THAT DRIFT WAS NOT A MAJOR COMPONENT OF THE CHEMICAL
17 COMPOUND ITSELF. WE STILL HAVE SOME DISAGREEMENTS ON
18 THAT, BUT THE MOLECULAR SIZE AND ITS VOLATILITY, WE DO
19 HAVE SOME ROLE ON THAT; BUT IT BASICALLY CAME DOWN TO
20 APPLICATION HEIGHT, THE MEAN DIAMETER OF THE DROPLETS AND
21 WIND SPEED. AND REGARDLESS OF ANYTHING ELSE, THOSE ARE
22 THE THREE PREDOMINANT FACTORS.
23 SO, YOU KNOW, AIRPLANE -- AERIAL APPLICATION
24 AND HOW YOU DROP A SIZE, HOW YOU BREAK THEM UP AND WIND
25 SPEED ARE YOUR FACTORS MOVING OFF SITE, SO IT IS
0027
01 DEFINITELY PART OF THE APPLICATION PRACTICE.
02 DR. FRIEDMAN: BUT IS IT A CHARACTERISTIC OF THE
03 CHEMICAL? SOME CHEMICALS HAVE TO GET SPRAYED FROM HIGHER
04 LEVELS THAN OTHERS?
05 MR. GOSSELIN: YES. THAT'S PART OF IT; BUT, AGAIN,
06 I THINK ALL THINGS BEING EQUAL, SOME OF THE PROBLEMS WE'VE
07 HAD IS SOIL-INJECTED FUMIGANTS. METHYL BROMIDE CAME
08 ALONG, AND THOSE ARE DIRECTED INTO THE SOIL AND THERE WERE
09 FOUND UNREASONABLE LEVELS OFF SITE, SO IT -- IT IS A
10 MULTI-VARIABLE ISSUE.
11 DR. SEIBER: WELL, I GUESS MAYBE ONE RESPONSE TO
12 DR. FRIEDMAN'S QUESTION IS THAT IT'S A FUNCTION OF THE
13 CHEMICAL INSOFAR AS SOME CHEMICALS ARE DELIVERED
14 PRIMARILY, LET'S SAY, BY AIR OR BY ORCHARD SPEED SPRAYER.
15 THAT'S ANOTHER TYPE OF APPLICATION THAT GIVES RISE TO A
16 LOT OF PARTICULAR DRIFT, WHEREAS OTHERS ARE APPLIED TO THE
17 SOIL WITH THE GROUND RIG AND THAT'S ABOUT THE ONLY WAY
18 THEY'RE APPLIED.
19 SO IN THAT REGARD, THERE'S QUITE A RANGE AND
20 IT SEEMS TO ME THAT AT LEAST MAYBE IF IT DOESN'T ENTER
21 INTO THE SCORING DIRECTLY, IT OUGHT TO AT LEAST BE TAKEN

22 INTO ACCOUNT WHEN YOU'RE -- BECAUSE PARAQUAT IS DOWN THERE
23 AT NUMBER 61 AND THAT WAS ONE OF THE FIRST CHEMICALS THAT
24 WAS -- THAT WAS A HIGH-PRIORITY CHEMICAL AND IT PROBABLY
25 SHOULD HAVE BEEN, EVEN THOUGH ITS PHYSICAL --
0028
01 MR. GOSSELIN: WE HAVE DRIFT REGULATIONS
02 SPECIFICALLY ON PARAQUAT BECAUSE OF FINAL TOXICITY AND
03 OFF-SITE IMPACT --
04 MR. KELLEY: AND THAT --
05 MR. GOSSELIN: -- AND --
06 MR. KELLEY: I HAVE AN EXPLANATION OF WHY WE DIDN'T
07 ACTUALLY USE IT AS A CRITERION. WE DID CONSIDER IT. THE
08 PROBLEM WAS THAT SINCE THE SWIFT FUMIGANTS ARE AS VOLATILE
09 AND MOVE AS RAPIDLY FROM A FIELD AS A CLOUD DRIFT AND
10 PARTICLES, THE PROBLEM WAS THAT IN THE -- IN THESE
11 CHEMICALS THAT WE HAVE HERE, ONLY ONE CHEMICAL -- AND THAT
12 WAS METEORON (PHONETIC) -- CANNOT BE APPLIED BY AIR OR WAS
13 NOT A SOIL-INJECTED FUMIGANT PESTICIDE.
14 SO WHAT HAPPENED WAS OUT OF THE FIRST 50
15 CHEMICALS, THEY ALL GOT FOUR POINTS. SO ALL IT DID REALLY
16 WAS JUST RAISE -- THE HIGHEST SCORE, I THINK, HERE IS 21
17 POINTS. IT JUST RAISED THAT UP TO 25. AND THEN FROM 50
18 TO 100, THERE'S ONLY SIX OTHER CHEMICALS THAT ARE NOT
19 APPLIED BY AIR; AND OF THOSE CHEMICALS, ALL SIX OF THEM
20 ARE APPLIED IN ORCHARDS WITH BLAST SPRAYERS BEING SPRAYED
21 UP INTO THE TREES. SO THEY WOULD HAVE GOTTEN THREE POINTS
22 WITH THE CRITERION HERE.
23 WHAT HAPPENED HERE IS IT BASICALLY RAISED
24 EVERYTHING. I THINK THE DISCUSSION OF WHY WE USE THAT, I
25 THINK, IS VERY IMPORTANT FOR THE DOCUMENT; BUT IT IS
0029
01 CONSIDERED IN THE EVALUATION AND THE TOPOLOGICAL PORTIONS
02 OF OUR DOCUMENTS WHEN WE GET TO THE DOCUMENTS.
03 DR. FROINES: LET ME ASK YOU THIS.
04 MR. KELLEY: DID --
05 DR. FRIEDMAN: THAT'S --
06 MR. KELLEY: I'M SORRY.
07 DR. FRIEDMAN: THAT'S WHY I ASKED IF THERE'S A LOT
08 OF VARIABILITY OF COMPOUNDS WITH RESPECT TO DRIFT, BECAUSE
09 IF THERE ISN'T IN THE DRIFT, IT WOULD JUST RAISE
10 EVERYTHING; BUT IF THERE'S A LOT OF VARIATION AND SOME ARE
11 APT TO DRIFT A LOT MORE THAN OTHERS, THEN IT MIGHT CHANGE
12 THE RANKING.
13 MR. GOSSELIN: YEAH. AND I THINK JUST FROM A MAJOR
14 STANDPOINT, BECAUSE EVERYTHING POTENTIALLY COULD BE
15 AERIALLY APPLIED AND I THINK THAT'S WHEN WE GO BACK AND
16 LOOK DEEPER INTO WHAT'S BEHIND THE USE PRACTICE OF THE
17 REAL WORLD, OR THE REAL WORLD AS WE LOOK AT IT IN THAT
18 YEAR, BECAUSE IT CHANGES OVER TIME. BUT WHAT IS THE
19 PREDOMINANT APPLICATION PRACTICES? IS IT AIR? IS IT
20 SOIL-INJECTED? IS IT PUT THROUGH A DRIP IRRIGATION?
21 AND, YOU KNOW, RIGHT NOW WE'RE NOT ABLE TO
22 CAPTURE THAT IN THE RANKING SYSTEM, BUT I THINK WHEN WE GO
23 BACK AND TAKE A LOOK AT THESE CANDIDATES GOING TOP TO
24 BOTTOM, LOOKING INTO MORE, YOU KNOW, IS THE USE PRACTICE
25 GOING UP AND DOWN, HOW IS IT USED, METHOD OF APPLICATION,
0030

01 AND THE TIME OF THE YEAR AND THE WEATHER PATTERNS, THAT
02 WILL RESULT IN MORE OFF-SITE MOVEMENT DRIFT. SO I THINK
03 THE ANSWER IS YES, WE DO HAVE TO TAKE ALL OF THAT INTO
04 ACCOUNT.
05 DR. FRIEDMAN: COULD I JUST -- I DON'T KNOW
06 ANYTHING ABOUT, YOU KNOW, AGRICULTURAL USES OF THESE
07 THINGS; BUT I MEAN, JIM, WHEN YOU LOOK AT THIS LIST, DOES
08 CERTAIN THINGS STAND OUT THAT ARE GIVEN LOW PRIORITY THAT
09 YOU THINK SHOULD BE GIVEN HIGH BECAUSE OF DRIFT? DO YOU
10 SEE EXAMPLES WHERE YOU THINK THIS SYSTEM IS NOT WORKING IN
11 TERMS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF TOXICITY?
12 DR. SEIBER: I THINK THIS IS A GOOD NUMERICAL
13 RANKING SCHEME AS LONG AS IT'S NOT THE ONLY INFORMATION
14 THAT'S USED, AND I THINK THAT WHAT WE'RE HEARING IS THAT
15 APPLICATION METHODS, WHICH ARE CHANGING ALL THE TIME, IS
16 STILL CONSIDERED WHEN YOU ACTUALLY GO AND INVESTIGATE,
17 LET'S SAY, A SPECIFIC CHEMICAL.
18 SO ONES THAT ARE APPLIED EXCLUSIVELY BY AIR
19 TO LARGE ACREAGE CROPS LIKE COTTON, FOR EXAMPLE, SHOULD --
20 AND THAT'S WHERE PARAQUAT FELL. THAT'S WHY IT WAS RIGHT
21 UP AT THE TOP OF THE LIST BEFORE, SEVERAL YEARS AGO.
22 AS LONG AS THOSE THINGS ARE STILL FACTORED
23 INTO THE DECISIONMAKING, I THINK WE'RE OKAY. I THINK
24 WHAT WE'RE HEARING IS IT'S HARD TO PUT THOSE ON A
25 NUMERICAL SCALE TO, YOU KNOW, GIVE SCORES FOR THOSE
0031
01 THINGS.
02 DR. FROINES: BUT I THINK THAT PARAQUAT ENDS UP
03 AS 61 AND ETHYL ALCOHOL ENDS UP AS 59. IT SEEMS TO ME
04 THERE'S A CONTRADICTION THERE.
05 DR. PITTS: WELL, PARAQUAT ON THE ROCKS IS NOT
06 INDICATED EXCEPT IN A FEW BARS I RAN ACROSS MANY YEARS
07 AGO.
08 DR. FROINES: I DON'T KNOW. IS THERE A DRIFT
09 PROBLEM WITH PARAQUAT?
10 DR. SEIBER: YES, THERE IS.
11 MR. GOSSELIN: YES.
12 DR. FROINES: SO THEREIN LIES THE POINT OF GARY'S
13 QUESTION.
14 MR. GOSSELIN: WELL --
15 DR. FROINES: SHOULD PARAQUAT BE AT 61, GIVEN ITS
16 POTENTIAL EXPOSURE CHARACTERISTICS?
17 MR. GOSSELIN: YEAH. I THINK ONE OF THE THINGS
18 THAT -- I DON'T KNOW HOW YOU WOULD PUT IT INTO A MATRIX;
19 BUT, YOU KNOW, MAKING SOME GOOD MANAGEMENT DECISIONS AND
20 JUDGMENTS ON WHAT'S HAPPENING IN THE REAL WORLD AND I
21 THINK THE EXAMPLE THAT YOU JUST POINTED OUT, PARAQUAT, AND
22 WHERE IT'S RANKED COMPARED TO OTHER MATERIALS IN AND OF
23 ITSELF MAY NOT LOOK LIKE A GOOD FIT; BUT THAT'S WHERE I
24 THINK TAKING A LOOK AT THIS REPORT AND THIS LIST AS A
25 GUIDE AND THEN USING THAT AND GOING BACK AND TRYING TO
0032
01 LOOK AT THE WORST ACTORS TO MONITOR FROM.
02 THERE ARE A GOOD DEAL OF US ALL SITTING
03 AROUND HERE WHO ARE NOT EVEN ABLE TO USE OUR BEST JUDGMENT
04 THAT WE GET INTO THE FIELD FROM THE COUNTIES, FROM MY OWN
05 FIELD ENFORCEMENT STAFF, FROM COUNTY HEALTH OFFICES AND

06 OTHERS WHO BRING TO OUR ATTENTION WHAT THE SCIENCE AND THE
07 BEST EVALUATION CAN'T REALLY TELL US ABOUT WHAT'S
08 HAPPENING IN THE REAL WORLD BECAUSE OF ALL THESE VARIABLES
09 AND FACTORS, BUT THIS IS REALLY INTENDED TO BE A GOOD
10 GUIDE.
11 SO IF YOU'RE ASKING -- YOU KNOW, IF WE START
12 PRESENTING YOU WITH DOCUMENTS ON T.A.C.'S, YOUR FIRST
13 QUESTION IS GOING TO BE, YOU KNOW, "HOW'D YOU CHOOSE THIS
14 ONE OVER THIS ONE?" AT LEAST NOW WE HAVE SOME ROAD MAP TO
15 FOLLOW ON HOW WE EXPEND OUR DOLLARS TO MONITOR FROM; AND I
16 THINK WITH THE SQUEEZING RESOURCES WE ALL HAVE, WE NEED TO
17 MAKE SURE WE SPEND IT IN THE RIGHT SPOT AND THIS IS JUST
18 TO PROVIDE A ROAD MAP TO DO THAT.
19 DR. FROINES: WELL, I AGREE AND DISAGREE. THIS IS
20 ALSO A PUBLIC DOCUMENT THAT THE PUBLIC HAS TO BE ABLE TO
21 RELY ON AND SOMETIMES THE PUBLIC ISN'T VERY TRUSTING OF
22 PEOPLE OR GOVERNMENT AGENCIES THAT SAYS, "HERE'S A
23 DOCUMENT, BUT WE USE A LOT OF OTHER WAYS TO DO IT."
24 DEPENDING UPON YOUR CREDIBILITY, PEOPLE CAN SAY, "WELL, I
25 TRUST THAT" OR "I DON'T TRUST IT." AND SO ONE HAS TO BE
0033
01 CAREFUL WHEN THEY SAY, "WELL, I'VE GOT THIS PUBLIC
02 DOCUMENT, BUT WE HAVE THESE OTHER WAYS WE DO IT OVER HERE
03 AND WE USE OUR JUDGMENT," AND YOU KNOW WAS WELL AS I DO
04 THAT THAT CREATES POTENTIAL PROBLEMS.
05 IT'S BETTER WHEN WE HAVE THINGS THAT PEOPLE
06 CAN SAY, "THIS IS HOW IT'S DONE, THESE ARE THE REASONS WHY
07 WE DO IT AND THIS IS HOW WE JUSTIFY IT." SO, FOR EXAMPLE,
08 UNDER THE A.R.B. AIR MONITORING ON THE FRONT ON
09 PARAQUAT --
10 DR. PITTS: WHAT PAGE IS THAT?
11 DR. FROINES: ROMAN NUMERAL VII.
12 DR. PITTS: ON PAGE SEVEN. OKAY. GOT IT.
13 DR. FROINES: IN A.R.B.'S AIR MONITORING, HAVE THEY
14 BEEN LOOKING AT DRIFT IN THEIR AIR MONITORING STUDIES OR
15 IS THAT -- IS DRIFT INCLUDED IN THAT PROTOCOL?
16 MR. GOSSELIN: THE PROTOCOL -- IT'S A COMPONENT OF
17 BOTH BECAUSE THE MONITORING IS DONE DIRECTLY OFF SITE.
18 YOU CAN JUMP IN IF I'M WRONG, BUT THERE ARE
19 TWO COMPONENTS OF THE MONITORING. ONE IS MONITORING
20 DIRECTLY OFF SITE DURING THE APPLICATION THAT WILL FACTOR
21 IN THAT COMPONENT OF DRIFT AS THE RESULT OF THE
22 APPLICATION, AND THEN THERE'S THE OFF-SITE AMBIENT
23 COMMUNITY MONITORING THAT WOULD SORT OF DEAL WITH THAT
24 LIFTOFF AND EXPOSURE. SO THAT'S WHERE YOU GET THE TWO
25 SETS OF DATA COMING ON.
0034
01 DR. SEIBER: YEAH. I WOULD -- THERE IS SOME
02 EXPLANATORY INFORMATION ON WHAT THE DOCUMENT'S FOR AND
03 WHAT IT CAN'T DO AND WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION. IS THAT
04 ANYWHERE? I COULDN'T FIND IT. IT WASN'T ADDRESSED IN
05 THERE.
06 MR. KELLEY: IT'S IN THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND ALSO
07 STARTING OFF ON PAGE ONE. IT'S A HISTORY OF 1807 AND THEN
08 ON PAGE TWO THERE'S A FULL PURPOSE STATEMENT BECAUSE OF
09 WHAT A LOT OF THE COMMENTS WE GOT ORIGINALLY WERE. SO WE
10 DIDN'T CALL ALL THESE THINGS T.A.C.'S. SO THE PURPOSE

11 WASN'T REALLY CLEAR.
12 DR. SEIBER: BUT IS DR. FROINES' CONCERN ABOUT --
13 MR. GOSSELIN: LET ME --
14 DR. SEIBER: DO YOU THINK IT'S COVERED IN SOME OF
15 THE VERSIONS? I DIDN'T READ THROUGH IT CAREFULLY TO SEE
16 IF IT'S IN THE EXPLANATORY MATERIAL. DO YOU FEEL THAT
17 IT'S ADDRESSED THERE? COULD YOU POINT TO MAYBE A
18 PARAGRAPH?
19 MR. KELLEY: TO INFER WHICH EXACTLY?
20 MR. GOSSELIN: ON THE METHODOLOGY ON PICKING UP
21 DRIFT?
22 DR. SEIBER: YES. RIGHT.
23 MR. KELLEY: THAT'S NOT ADDRESSED IN THIS DOCUMENT.
24 DR. SEIBER: OKAY.
25 MR. KELLEY: GENERALLY, THE DEPARTMENT'S FEELINGS
0035
01 IN THE PAST HAVE BEEN THAT DRIFT BEING AN ILLEGAL PORTION
02 OF THE APPLICATION THAT WE HAD OTHER LAWS AND REGULATIONS
03 BY WHICH TO GO RIGHT AFTER DRIFT IMMEDIATELY RATHER THAN
04 GOING THROUGH THIS WHOLE PROCESS OF, YOU KNOW, TO
05 DETERMINE IF SOMETHING IS A T.A.C. BECAUSE OF DRIFT OR NOT
06 BECAUSE OF DRIFT AND THEN GO FROM THERE.
07 DR. GLANTZ: YEAH, BUT I MEAN THIS IS THE
08 DISCUSSION WE HAD SOME YEARS AGO. I MEAN, I JUST FIND
09 THAT KIND OF AN ASTONISHING ATTITUDE. I MEAN, AT ONE
10 LEVEL YOU'RE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT THAT IF SOMEONE IS DOING
11 THINGS IN WAYS VERY INCONSISTENT WITH THE REGULATIONS, YOU
12 WANT TO STOP IT.
13 BUT THE FACT IS IT HAPPENS AND THE EXPOSURE
14 THAT PEOPLE SUFFER OUT THERE, THERE'S A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF
15 MISAPPLICATION AND DRIFT GOING ON AND I THINK WHEN YOU --
16 UNLESS YOU CAN COME IN AND ASSURE 100-PERCENT COMPLIANCE,
17 WHICH IS IMPOSSIBLE, IT SEEMS TO ME IT OUGHT TO BE
18 CONSIDERED IN TERMS OF THE EXPOSURE MODELING AND THE RISK
19 ASSESSMENT. YOU KNOW, THAT'S NOT TO STAY YOU'RE NOT
20 MAKING YOUR BEST EFFORTS TO STOP THEM.
21 MR. KELLEY: RIGHT, BUT --
22 DR. GLANTZ: I MEAN, THE FACT IS NO MATTER HOW GOOD
23 A JOB YOU GUYS DO, IT'S STILL GOING TO BE OUT THERE TO
24 SOME EXTENT AND I THINK YOU CAN'T SORT OF -- I MEAN, WHAT
25 STRUCK ME IS WHEN WE HAD THIS DISCUSSION SOME YEARS AGO
0036
01 WAS BASICALLY YOU'RE KIND OF ASSUMING THAT AN EXPOSURE
02 DOESN'T EXIST BY ADMINISTRATIVE FIAT AND THAT'S NOT
03 SCIENCE.
04 MR. GOSSELIN: NO. AND I AGREE WITH YOU WITHOUT
05 ACTUALLY SPLITTING HEADS ON OUTSIDE MOVEMENT AND DRIFT AND
06 THE MARGIN DOES COVER BOTH COMPONENTS. IT DOES PICK UP
07 THE DRIFT, THE OUTSIDE MOVEMENT AS A RESULT OF THE
08 APPLICATION, AND THE SUBSEQUENT AND WE HAVE COUNTLESS
09 EXAMPLES WHERE, YOU KNOW, THE -- THE QUESTION OF WHETHER
10 IT WAS DRIFT OR OUTSIDE MOVEMENT OR LIFTOFF OF THE
11 MATERIAL.
12 DR. GLANTZ: RIGHT.
13 MR. GOSSELIN: NO ONE REALLY CAN UNDERSTAND. SO
14 WHETHER YOU CALL IT DRIFT OR OUTSIDE MOVEMENT, YOU KNOW,
15 IF IT'S CAUSING A PROBLEM, WE DON'T REALLY CARE WHICH WAY

16 IT'S COMING OFF. YOU KNOW, WE CAN REGULATE AND HAVE
17 REGULATED THAT AND I THINK PARTICULARLY WITH -- THIS GETS
18 PICKED UP A LOT WITH FINAL TOXICITY AND ADJACENT CROPS,
19 AND THERE'S ARGUMENT DEPENDING ON WHERE YOU'RE SITTING.
20 SOME PEOPLE POINT THE FINGER AT THE APPLICATORS AND THEN
21 WE'LL LOOK AT THE LIFTOFF OF THE MATERIAL AND IT'S A
22 COMBINATION OF BOTH THINGS.
23 THE PROBLEM IS THE DAMAGE IS STILL HAPPENING,
24 AND YOU CAN GO IN AND REGULATE IT. IF THE DAMAGE IS
25 HAPPENING OR IF THE EXPOSURE IS HIGH ENOUGH WHETHER IT IS
0037
01 DRIFT OR OFF-SITE MOVEMENT, WE'LL GO IN AND REGULATE
02 THAT.
03 SO IF THERE'S AN OVERARCHING REGULATORY
04 POSITION ON REGULATING DRIFT, WE CAN PUT SPECIFIC
05 STANDARDS AND HAVE SOME SPECIFIC STANDARDS IN REGULATIONS
06 TO CONTROL AERIAL APPLICATION DRIFT, AND THAT'S SOMETHING
07 WE DO NEED TO GO BACK AND TAKE A LOOK AT. SO REGARDLESS
08 OF THE MATERIAL OR THE TOXICITY, JUST KEEPING THE MATERIAL
09 ON-SITE AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE NEEDS TO BE ENHANCED, BUT
10 WE'RE NOT HIDING BEHIND SAYING, "WELL, IT'S ILLEGAL SO
11 WE'RE NOT GOING TO REGULATE THAT AND EVERYTHING'S FINE,"
12 BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE A COP IN EVERY CORNER AND WE'RE NOT
13 GOING TO HAVE ONE. SO IT'S -- I MEAN, IT'S YES TO ALL
14 THOSE THINGS.
15 DR. GLANTZ: OKAY. BUT, SEE, I'M NOT ADDRESSING
16 THE ISSUE OF WHAT YOU OUGHT TO DO IN TERMS OF REGULATION.
17 IT'S MORE TO ENSURE THAT THAT COMPONENT OF THE EXPOSURE
18 GETS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT. EVEN THOUGH IT'S NOT SUPPOSED TO
19 BE THERE, IT IS. IT'S LIKE I TELL MY KID TO CLEAN UP HIS
20 ROOM; THAT DOESN'T MAKE IT CLEAN. THAT JUST MAKES ME
21 FRUSTRATED --
22 MR. GOSSELIN: YEAH. AND I --
23 DR. GLANTZ: -- BUT I FEEL BETTER.
24 MR. GOSSELIN: FOR EXAMPLE, IF A PARTICULAR
25 MATERIAL WE'RE MONITORING IN ITS PRACTICE AND LET'S SAY
0038
01 AERIAL APPLICATION AND WE MONITOR THAT AND IT'S DRIFTING
02 OFF SITE BECAUSE OF THAT, OR IT'S AN ORCHARD POWER BLAST
03 MIST BLOWER WHICH HAS A LOT OF DRIFT COMPONENTS TO, EVEN
04 IF EITHER OF THOSE RESULT IN HIGH EXPOSURES OFF-SITE, YOU
05 KNOW, WE WOULD MOVE FORWARD IN REGULATING THAT.
06 EVEN THOUGH IT'S NOT WAITING FOR THE MATERIAL
07 TO LIFT OFF, WE'D GO IN AND REGULATE THAT PRACTICE TO
08 BRING THE USE OF THAT PRODUCT WITHIN ACCEPTABLE,
09 RESPECTABLE STANDARDS.
10 DR. GLANTZ: RIGHT, BUT I'M NOT TAKING ABOUT THE
11 REGULATORY ASPECTS. I'M TALKING ABOUT MAKING SURE THAT
12 EXPOSURE GETS CONSIDERED IN TERMS OF THIS STUFF, THE FACT
13 THAT THAT HAPPENS.
14 MR. GOSSELIN: IT WILL BECAUSE WE'LL BE OUT
15 MONITORING FOR IT AND I THINK WHEN WE GO BACK IN AND TAKE
16 A LOOK AT THE LIST OF COMPOUNDS, ONE OF THE THINGS WE GO
17 BACK AND LOOK AT IS WHAT'S THE PRINCIPAL APPLICATION
18 PRACTICE AND HOW IS IT APPLIED IN CONJUNCTION WITH ITS OWN
19 CHEMISTRY OF THE MATERIAL AND THE TEMPERATURE AND
20 EVERYTHING ELSE? IS THIS STUFF GOING TO GET OFF SITE AND

21 EXPOSE PEOPLE OFF SITE?
22 DR. FRIEDMAN: TO HELP US UNDERSTAND WHAT OTHER
23 CRITERIA YOU USE TO SET PRIORITIES, I JUST RECALL YOU SAID
24 THERE ARE THREE COMPOUNDS. YOU TALKED ABOUT METAM-SODIUM,
25 D.E.F. AND --
0039
01 MR. GOSSELIN: AZINPHOS-METHYL.
02 DR. FRIEDMAN: NOW, LOOKING AT YOUR TABLE THERE, I
03 SEE THEY'RE NUMBERED 3, 4 AND 23. WHY DIDN'T YOU PICK
04 ONE, TWO AND THREE?
05 MR. GOSSELIN: ONE IS AGAIN, THIS IS AN UPDATED
06 DOCUMENT FROM 1987, SO SOME OF THIS MIGHT BE HISTORICAL ON
07 MONITORING THAT WAS DONE IN LIGHT OF SORT OF WHAT WAS
08 BETWEEN 1987 AND 1995, AND THEN WE HAVE THE DATA OR THE
09 MONITORING DATA FROM A.R.B. AND IT'S A MATTER OF WHEN
10 WE'RE COMPLETING THE FULL RISK ASSESSMENT ON THOSE
11 COMPOUNDS TO COME DOWN. SO IN SHORT ANSWER, IT'S -- YOU
12 KNOW, IT'S JUST A MATTER OF US GETTING TO ALL THESE 200.
13 MR. KELLEY: ALSO --
14 DR. FRIEDMAN: I MEAN --
15 MR. KELLEY: EXCUSE ME. IF I MAY CLARIFY THIS, IN
16 OUR MODIFICATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE TOXIC AIR
17 CONTAMINANTS LIST, WHICH WAS THE REPORT BEFORE THIS, THERE
18 WERE, I THINK, 24 CHEMICALS IN THERE. 14 OF THOSE
19 CHEMICALS WE HAD MONITORING DATA FOR READY TO PROGRESS
20 WITH THE REPORT DATA VARIATION. THEY BECAME HAZARDOUS AIR
21 POLLUTANTS SO THEY'RE NOT TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS BASED ON
22 THE POLLUTANTS.
23 SO AT THE TIME, ALL OF THIS WAS SORT OF VOID
24 BECAUSE IT DIDN'T LEAVE US ANY MONITORING DATA FOR THE
25 COMPOUNDS; AND SINCE AZINPHOS-METHYL IS VERY HIGH, THAT'S
0040
01 WHY WE'VE GOT THE PARTIAL MONITORING DATA. PART OF THE
02 DATA IS DONE AND THAT'S ALL READY TO GO FORWARD FOR THIS
03 1807 PROCESS IS RELYING ON THE EVALUATION DONE.
04 DR. FRIEDMAN: I CAN UNDERSTAND ALL THAT, ALL
05 THAT'S ACCOMPLISHED. DO WE UNDERSTAND THEN THAT ONCE ALL
06 THESE HISTORICAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS HAVE BEEN PUT TO USE THAT
07 THEN YOU'LL DO ONE, TWO, FIVE ON THIS LIST?
08 MR. GOSSELIN: I THINK PART OF THIS IS WHAT WE'RE
09 DEALING WITH. IT IS ALSO WE'RE CHANGING THE REGULATORY
10 SCHEME LIKE PROPRAGITE, WHICH WAS NUMBER ONE. AND I ASKED
11 THAT SAME QUESTION. IF WE COULD MONITOR FOR
12 PROPARGITE, AND I KNOW WE HAD IT ON THE TOP OF OUR REQUEST
13 LIST FOR MONITORING, AND THE THING THAT HAPPENED LAST
14 SUMMER WAS E.P.A. WITH THE REGISTRAR PULLED MOST OF THE
15 USES OF PROPARGITE OFF THE LABELS.
16 SO WHAT YOU'RE DEALING WITH IS SOME THINGS
17 THAT MIGHT BE HIGH ON THE LIST, ALL OF A SUDDEN THEIR USES
18 GO BY THE WAYSIDE AND IT'S NOT USED ANYMORE. THERE IS
19 SOME STILL USES OF PROPARGITE, LIMITED USES, THAT WE NEED
20 TO GO BACK AND LOOK AT; BUT THAT CHANGE HAS MAJOR
21 IMPLICATIONS ON ITS AMOUNT OF USE, WHICH GOES TO DO YOU
22 WANT TO CHASE AROUND SOMETHING NOT USED ANYMORE?
23 PART OF THAT -- AND THIS IS WHY WE WANTED TO
24 GO INTO MORE OF A REGULAR CYCLE OF UPDATING THIS, THE USE
25 OF THESE COMPOUNDS. A LOT OF FACTORS KEEP CHANGING AND WE

0041
01 NEED TO KEEP PACE WITH THAT. SO WE HAVE A GOOD MAP ON THE
02 DIRECTION WE'RE GOING FROM OUR TERMS.
03 DR. FRIEDMAN: SO IN OTHER WORDS, THAT SALES AND
04 USE DATA OF 1990 REPORT, IT GOT YANKED DOWN FURTHER, BUT
05 NOW IT GOT DROPPED WAY DOWN AND IT WILL BE ON THE LIST.
06 MR. GOSSELIN: RIGHT. AND SOMETHING FURTHER ON THE
07 LIST MIGHT PICK UP AND MIGHT BE AERIALLY APPLIED AND
08 THAT'S GOING TO CHANGE SOME OF THE JUDGMENTS OF WHAT YOU
09 WANT TO TRY TO GET IN ON.
10 MR. KELLEY: THERE'S ONE PESTICIDE, AMITRAZ, WHICH
11 HAS GONE FROM BASICALLY NO USE IN '93 TO ABOUT 2,000 --
12 EXCUSE ME. '91 WAS VERY LITTLE USE, '92 LITTLE USE AND
13 THEN IN '94 IT'S GONE ABOUT UP TO 80,000 POUNDS SO THINGS
14 ARE CHANGING ON A VARYING BASIS. SO ALTHOUGH AMITRAZ IS
15 NUMBER 31, IT MAY TURN OUT TO BE FAIRLY HIGH ON THE LIST
16 AND IT'S ACTUALLY GOING TO BE ONE OF THE SIX CHEMICALS.
17 THAT WE WHY THE E.P.A. IS MONITORING IT.
18 DR. SEIBER: I GUESS WHAT I'M PICKING UP IS THERE'S
19 NO ONE SINGLE LIST THAT REALLY CAN BE USED AS A HARD AND
20 FAST GUIDE IN MAKING PRIORITIZATION BECAUSE THEY'RE OUT IN
21 THE FIELD, THEY'RE GETTING A LOT OF INFORMATION FROM
22 DIFFERENT SOURCES AND THAT ALL KIND OF GETS FACTORED INTO
23 DECISION-MAKING FOR A GIVEN YEAR ON WHICH CHEMICALS TO
24 MONITOR FOR AND CONSIDER.
25 I DON'T KNOW WITH OUR PANEL, SINCE WE WORK ON
0042
01 A SOMEWHAT DIFFERENT TIME FRAME, WHEN DOCUMENTS GET
02 DELIVERED TO S.R.P. THEY MAY BE FROM DATA FROM TWO OR
03 THREE YEARS AGO, SO WE'VE GOT TO BE AWARE THAT THESE
04 THINGS ARE CHANGING ALL THE TIME, TOO, AND I DON'T KNOW
05 EXACTLY HOW WE DEAL WITH THAT.
06 DR. FRIEDMAN: I THINK, THOUGH, TO ADDRESS
07 DR. FROINES' CONCERN, IT WOULD BE NICE TO PUT SOME
08 DISCUSSION OF THAT IN THIS REPORT. MAYBE IT'S ALREADY
09 THERE AND I MISSED IT.
10 DR. FROINES: WELL, IN RELATION TO THAT, YOU KNOW,
11 AS YOU GO THROUGH HERE -- AND I'M TRYING TO DO IT AS
12 QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE -- IN TERMS OF A.R.B. AIR MONITORING,
13 YOU HAVE PRIORITIES RANKING FROM 14, 17, 26, 28, 49, 61,
14 106. IF YOU -- GOING BACK TO YOUR QUESTION, WHEN YOU LOOK
15 AT THE ACTUAL PRIORITIES, WHAT YOU'RE ASKING FOR A.R.B.
16 MONITORING, IT DOESN'T MAKE ANY SENSE.
17 MR. KELLEY: WELL, ACTUALLY, IN A WAY IT POSSIBLY
18 DOES BECAUSE ONE COULD LOOK AT THE PRIOR DOCUMENTS AND
19 SAY, WHAT IS THIS? WAS IT USED IN CALIFORNIA? DID WE --
20 WERE WE INVESTIGATING IT TO START WITH? AND IF THOSE TWO
21 ARE ANSWERED YES, WAS IT AERIALLY APPLIED? AND ASK THE
22 NEXT QUESTION AND THOSE COMPOUNDS ALL GOT PUT INTO THE
23 PREVIOUS DOCUMENT WITH SOME MODIFICATIONS.
24 DR. FROINES: LET'S ASSUME THERE WAS SOME LOGIC
25 EARLIER. THAT'S FINE. I'M NOT JUST TRYING TO BE
0043
01 CRITICAL, BUT IT SEEMS TO ME THEN YOU NEED A FOOTNOTE IN
02 HERE TO EXPLAIN TO THE READER WHY THIS THING LOOKS LIKE IT
03 DOES, BECAUSE IF YOU GET SOMEBODY WHO'S CAREFUL ABOUT WHAT
04 THEY DO, THEY'LL SAY, JUST LIKE I'VE SAID, "IT DOESN'T MAKE

05 ANY SENSE."
06 ALL I'M SAYING QUITE SIMPLY IS THERE HAS TO
07 BE A BASIS FOR THE PUBLIC TO UNDERSTAND WHAT'S BEING PUT
08 FORWARD BEFORE THEM.
09 MR. GOSSELIN: I AGREE AND THAT JUST SPEAKS TO THE
10 ACCOUNTABILITY, WHICH I THINK IS ABSOLUTELY IMPORTANT
11 ABOUT WHAT CHOICES WE MAKE ON MONITORING AND HOW WE CAN
12 BACK THAT UP WITH THE -- ALL THE SCIENCE AND DATA THAT WE
13 HAVE AVAILABLE AT THAT DATE, AND I THINK THAT'S A GOOD
14 POINT ON THE PRIOR MONITORING.
15 SO THAT'S PUT INTO PERSPECTIVE THAT PEOPLE
16 DON'T THINK WE WENT BY THIS AND SOMEHOW PICKED OUT 104 OUT
17 OF THE BLUE, THAT IT'S NOT SOME RAFFLE.
18 DR. FRIEDMAN: I THINK SOME VERBIAGE ABOUT HOW
19 THINGS CHANGE RAPIDLY AND SOME COMPOUNDS BECOME LESS
20 IMPORTANT AND OTHERS BECOME MORE WOULD BE USEFUL FOR THE
21 PUBLIC TO UNDERSTAND WHAT'S GOING ON.
22 MR. GOSSELIN: AND I THINK WE'RE SCHEDULED TO HAVE
23 A FORMAL -- FORMAL UPDATE OF THIS DOCUMENT -- IS IT -- IN
24 THREE YEARS, WHICH ISN'T A LOT OF TIME, BUT THE HORIZON
25 WILL CHANGE A LOT IN THREE YEARS.
0044
01 DR. PITTS: PERHAPS I COULD MAKE A COMMENT OR TWO
02 ALONG THE LINES OF WHAT I'VE HEARD. I THINK YOU HAVE TO
03 ASK YOURSELF THE QUESTION AS SCIENTISTS AND THEN ALSO AS
04 AN AGENCY, "TO WHAT AUDIENCE OR AUDIENCES IS THIS DOCUMENT
05 ADDRESSED?" B IS, "TO WHAT AUDIENCE OR AUDIENCES IS IT
06 NOT ADDRESSED, BUT WHO WILL RECEIVE THE DOCUMENT AND WILL
07 FOLLOW OUT AND CARRY OUT SOME LINES OF LOGIC ALONG THE
08 LINES WHICH WE'VE JUST HEARD THAT WILL LEAD TO SOME
09 CONCLUSIONS THAT REALLY DON'T REFLECT THE SCIENCE THAT'S
10 GONE INTO THIS OR THE RISK MANAGEMENT THAT'S GONE INTO
11 THIS," WHICH I THINK YOU'VE BEEN DISCUSSING THIS AND
12 CLARIFYING FOR US.
13 AND GIVEN THE FACT THAT WHEN ONE SEES TABLES
14 OF ALMOST ANYTHING -- YOU CAN SEE TABLES OF THE REACTIVITY
15 AND VOLATILITY OF A COMPOUND AND IN THE ATMOSPHERE TO MAKE
16 THE OZONE -- WELL, WHEN YOU REALLY GET DOWN TO IT, YOU
17 HAVE TO BE REALLY CAREFUL HOW YOU'RE DOING IT AND HOW IT
18 COMES OUT AS REGULATIONS, AS THE A.R.B. MORE THAN WELL
19 UNDERSTANDS AND IS HANDLING.
20 IT SEEMS TO ME GIVEN THE MAGNITUDE OF THE
21 INTEREST, IF YOUR AUDIENCE IS BEYOND A VERY LIMITED
22 AUDIENCE WHERE YOU CAN ACTUALLY SIT IN FRONT OF THEM WHEN
23 YOU GIVE THEM A TABLE LIKE THIS, GIVEN THE TIME AND EFFORT
24 YOU'VE PUT INTO IT, WHY DON'T YOU THINK ABOUT PUTTING
25 SPECIFICALLY IN DRIFT, SPECIFICALLY PUTTING IN THESE ITEMS
0045
01 WE'RE DISCUSSING, AND NOT JUST BY A SENTENCE BUT BY AN
02 EXAMPLE, PARAQUAT. GIVE US AN EXAMPLE, "OTHER COMPOUNDS
03 WHICH MIGHT BE SUBJECT MIGHT BE COMPOUNDS NUMBER DAH, DAH,
04 DAH."
05 IT'S REALLY WORTH THE TIME. IT WOULDN'T TAKE
06 YOU THAT MUCH TIME AND EFFORT, BECAUSE YOU'VE PUT A LOT OF
07 EFFORT INTO THE TABLES. SO THIS MIGHT BE SOMETHING TO DO
08 BEFORE THIS GETS OUT AS A PUBLIC DOCUMENT.
09 I WOULDN'T WANT TO BE IN YOUR POSITION WHEN

10 THIS COMES OUT AS A PUBLIC DOCUMENT WHEN YOU'RE DRAWING --
11 YOU GET ENOUGH FLAK ALREADY. YOU DON'T NEED IT WHEN
12 YOU'VE ALREADY ADDRESSED THE QUESTIONS.
13 MR. GOSSELIN: ACTUALLY, THAT'S A VERY GOOD POINT,
14 AND I THINK ALSO FOR THE ACCOUNTABILITY PAPER TRAIL ISSUE,
15 I'D SUGGEST WE TRANSMIT FORMAL REQUESTS OVER TO A.R.B. TO
16 DO MONITORING AND WE BASE IT FROM CRITERIA THAT WE HAVE
17 THAT'S LAID OUT HERE, AND WHAT I THINK MIGHT ADDRESS SORT
18 OF HOW WE BASE THOSE DECISIONS ON THE CURRENT SET OF DATA
19 IS TO TIE IT BACK TO THIS DOCUMENT AND SOME OF THE OTHER
20 FACTORS AND OTHER JUDGMENTS; AND THAT CREATES A FAIRLY
21 GOOD PAPER TRAIL AND WE CAN C.C. YOU AND THAT WILL CREATE
22 THE PAPER TRAIL ON HOW WE WENT DOWN THIS LIST AND OTHER
23 FACTORS THAT OCCURRED SUBSEQUENTLY THAT, YOU KNOW, FORCED
24 US TO SAY, "HERE, THIS IS A PRIME CANDIDATE TO GO OUT AND
25 MONITOR."
0046
01 THAT WAY, WE DON'T LOSE THE MAJOR FACTORS
02 THAT ARE OUTLINED IN THIS DOCUMENT AND THEN STILL ALLOW
03 THE DECISION TO GO FORWARD IN MONITORING SOME IN A TIMELY,
04 EFFICIENT WAY AND STILL BE ACCOUNTABLE TO EVERYONE WHO
05 MIGHT COME BACK AND ASK QUESTIONS, "WHY DID YOU CHOOSE
06 THIS ONE VERSUS THIS ONE" BECAUSE WE MAKE THOSE DECISIONS
07 ANYWAY. WE JUST NEED TO PUT IT DOWN IN THE TRANSMITTAL
08 DOCUMENT.
09 DR. PITTS: BUT IF IT GOES INTO -- OUT TO THE
10 GENERAL PUBLIC, YOU MIGHT WANT AN APPENDIX. LET ME GIVE
11 YOU AN EXAMPLE. ANOTHER POINT YOU MAKE HERE AND VERY
12 CLEARLY STATE ON PAGE ROMAN NUMERAL II -- AND FAIR
13 ENOUGH, YOU STATE IN THE SECOND PARAGRAPH:
14 "THE IDENTIFICATION AND RANKING OF
15 CANDIDATE T.A.C.'S ARE SUBJECT TO THE
16 FOLLOWING LIMITATIONS," AND YOU ACTUALLY
17 SAY, "ONE, THE USE AND SALES OF ANY
18 GIVEN PESTICIDE VARIES YEARLY; TWO, FOR
19 SOME PESTICIDES, SOME OR ALL OF THE
20 PHYSICAL DATA USED FOR THIS
21 PRIORITIZATION SCHEME MAY NOT BE
22 AVAILABLE."
23 THEN THREE, WHICH IS A POINT THAT -- ONE OF
24 THE POINTS THAT JIM AND I ARE PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN,
25 SAYS:
0047
01 "FOLLOWING THE APPLICATION, THE
02 A.I. MAY UNDERGO ENVIRONMENTAL REACTIONS
03 LEADING TO BY-PRODUCTS WITH TOXICITY
04 DIFFERENT FROM THE PARENT COMPOUND."
05 WELL, THAT'S ENVIRONMENT ACTIVATION OR
06 DEACTIVATION, AS IN THE CASE WITH TALONE (PHONETIC) AND
07 ACTIVATION WITH MALATHION, PARATHION. AND FOR EXAMPLE, IN
08 THAT REGARD, A PERSON WHO WOULD LOOK AT THIS AND COME IN
09 AND SAY, WELL, I LOOKED AT THE TABLE HERE AND AS I SEE
10 MALATHION LISTED ON THE TABLE AND METHYL PARATHION.
11 MALATHION IS NUMBER 54; BUT IF I COME TO ACUTE TOXICITY
12 AND THEN ROOTS, IS THAT THE ACUTE TOXICITY OF PURE
13 MALATHION C.P., CHEMICALLY PURE? IS IT NOW -- I'M NOT
14 QUITE FINISHED YET. IS IT THE TOXICITY OF THE ISSUE WHICH

15 IS USED IN THE SPRAY IN THE APPLICATION AND THERE'S SOME
16 REAL BAD ACTORS IN THAT ONE?
17 FINALLY AND MOST IMPORTANTLY, FROM A
18 VIEWPOINT OF THE ENVIRONMENT ACTIVATION, IT DOESN'T PROVE
19 A FACTOR OF 70 THAT OCCURS WHEN MALATHION IS OXIDIZED IN
20 AN AMBIENT AIR LIKE THAT, THAT BEING FUME OR SMOG AND
21 OZONE.
22 YOU'RE REALLY DEALING WITH MALEICZOLIN
23 (PHONETIC) AND MALEICZOLIN AS WE KNOW -- THE PAPER THAT
24 CAME OUT FROM YOUR GROUP, WHICH IS EXCELLENT. THAT
25 RESEARCH HAS HAD WORLDWIDE ATTENTION AND THE MAJOR
0048
01 QUESTION, SO IT SEEMS TO ME THAT AGAIN YOU MIGHT WANT TO
02 BE VERY CAREFUL ABOUT THIS BECAUSE PEOPLE WILL SEE IT.
03 AND THEN, FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAVE METHYL
04 PARATHION IS IN HERE, BUT HAVE YOU TREATED METHYL
05 PARATHION AND ITS TOXICITY BECAUSE OF THE WORK YOU'VE DONE
06 WITH THE A.R.B.?
07 AND YOU SEE AND JIM SEIBER'S GROUP SEES THESE
08 RESIDUES WILL LAST FOR A LONG PERIOD OF TIME AND THEIR
09 TOXICITIES ARE OUT THERE. SO I THINK YOU SHOULD PAUSE A
10 MOMENT -- MY OWN PERM- -- SORT OF A THOUGHT, PERSONAL
11 THOUGHT. PAUSE AND REALLY SIT DOWN AND CREATE SORT OF
12 GAME PLAN. WHERE IS THIS GOING TO GO? HOW IS IT GOING TO
13 BE -- NOT BECAUSE YOU'RE TRYING TO CON ANYBODY. YOU'RE
14 NOT CONNING.
15 WHAT YOU'RE TRYING TO DO IS INFORM PEOPLE IN
16 A POSITIVE WAY AND GIVE AN EXAMPLE. YES, MALATHION DOES,
17 BUT THIS IS -- THIS WAS FOR A DIFFERENT REASON. THIS IS
18 ANOTHER MATTER. IT'S NOT A MAJOR PROBLEM ANYWAY. EVEN 70
19 ISN'T THAT GREAT OR -- JUST GET SOMETHING IN HERE. I KNOW
20 THIS WILL BECOME A LARGER VOLUME, BUT EVEN GIVING SOME WAY
21 OF INDICATING WITH EXAMPLES COULD PROVE VERY HELPFUL TO
22 ALL CONCERNED.
23 DR. SEIBER: WELL, JIM, I THINK THIS DOCUMENT'S
24 ALREADY BEEN RELEASED; IS THAT CORRECT?
25 MR. GOSSELIN: YES.
0049
01 DR. SEIBER: SO THE BEST WE COULD DO IS MAYBE WHEN
02 YOU PRESENT THE DOCUMENT OR --
03 DR. PITTS: OKAY.
04 DR. SEIBER: -- YOU HAVE A LETTER OR SOMETHING
05 AGAIN RESTATING.
06 DR. PITTS: OR HAVE A FOLLOW-UP OR ADDENDUM. SAY,
07 "THIS IS A FOLLOW-UP OR ADDENDUM DOCUMENT" THAT CAN GO
08 WITH IT. JUST SAY, "WE'VE DISCUSSED IN FURTHER
09 DISCUSSIONS" AND INDICATE THIS IS JUST THE DATA TO BACK IT
10 UP AND INDICATE IT'S A BACK-UP DOCUMENT.
11 MR. GOSSELIN: I THINK THE CONTEXT OF THE DOCUMENT
12 IS REALLY IMPORTANT. AGAIN, AS I SAID, THIS IS A LIVING
13 DOCUMENT THAT WE ARE LOOKING TO UPDATE ON A REGULAR BASIS
14 AND MAKE IMPROVEMENTS ON, ESPECIALLY --
15 DR. PITTS: WELL, THE YEAR 2000 IS SOME YEARS
16 AWAY. IN OTHER WORDS, UPDATE IS UPDATE. IT'S A
17 PERCEPTION OF HOW FAR AWAY.
18 MR. GOSSELIN: ANYWAY, I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE
19 SAYING, BUT I THINK YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT WE'RE SAYING. I

20 APOLOGIZE. THE S.R.B. CAN BE HELPFUL.
21 DR. PITTS: ANOTHER THING I WOULD APPRECIATE AND
22 THAT I'D LIKE TO HAVE, SAY, IS A LIST OF THESE CHEMICAL
23 STRUCTURES AND THAT WILL BE VERY HELPFUL TO US. ONE OF
24 THE MOST EXCITING FIELDS IN THE SCIENCE FIELD IS THAT OF
25 TOXICOLOGY. YOUR WORK IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA ACROSS
0050
01 THE BOARDS AND THE A.R.B. FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE
02 PESTICIDE SYSTEM, IT'S A MODEL FOR OTHER STATES, FOR THE
03 E.P.A., AND FOR OTHER COUNTRIES DEVELOPED AND UNDEVELOPED,
04 SO IT'S -- THAT'S A VERY POSITIVE THING THAT'S BEGUN; BUT
05 IT WOULD BE VERY USEFUL IF YOU HAVE THIS BACK-UP DOCUMENT
06 AND HAVE A LIST OF STRUCTURES. WHY NOT? YOU'VE GOT THEM,
07 AND THEN THE CHEMISTS WHO WON'T KNOW AND IS SAYING, "WHAT
08 ARE THESE COMPOUNDS?" CAN SAY, "WELL, THAT'S A
09 AZINPHOS-METHYL. OKAY. I CAN" --
10 MR. GOSSELIN: ONE OF THE THINGS WITH THAT AND ONE
11 OF THE THINGS WE'RE TRYING TO MOVE TO IS TO PUT THOSE AND
12 SOME OF THE OTHER DOCUMENTS ONTO THE INTERNET HOME PAGE.
13 YOU CAN TIE RIGHT INTO OUR CHEMISTRY DATABASE, OUR USE
14 REPORTS, AND WE CAN CREATE THE LENGTHS AND LINKS AND YOU
15 CAN LINK DOWN TO OTHER RESEARCH FACILITIES WITH SOME
16 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS ON THAT.
17 SO THIS IS SORT OF AN EVOLVING AREA WE'RE
18 TRYING TO LOOK INTO, BECAUSE YOU KNOW FOR A WHILE THAT NO
19 MATTER HOW MUCH INFORMATION YOU PUT INTO THESE VOLUMES,
20 IT'S OUTDATED THE MINUTE IT HITS THE STREETS AND THAT'S
21 WHY I THINK -- I THINK THE PEOPLE DOING RESEARCH ARE USING
22 THE INTERNET MORE AND MORE, THAT WE'RE TRYING TO STEER
23 PEOPLE IN THAT DIRECTION BECAUSE YOU CAN GET A WEALTH OF
24 KNOWLEDGE REAL QUICKLY AT THE POINT OF A MOUSE.
25 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, YOU KNOW, HAVING SAID ALL OF
0051
01 THAT, THE -- AND RECOGNIZING THAT THINGS CHANGE, I'D LIKE
02 TO KIND OF COME BACK TO A POINT HERE AND SAY IT WOULD BE
03 KIND OF NICE IF THE COMPOUNDS YOU WERE WORKING ON WERE
04 SOMEWHERE IN THE TOP OF THE LIST AND IF NUMBER ONE IS NO
05 LONGER RELEVANT BECAUSE ITS REGISTRATION HAS BEEN
06 CHANGED, THEN OKAY. BUT IT SEEMS YOU SHOULD BE PUTTING
07 SOME OF THE TOP FIVE OR SIX OR TEN INTO THE PROCESS.
08 NOW, IF THE PROCESS WERE STARTED BASED ON THE
09 BEST AVAILABLE INFORMATION THREE OR FOUR YEARS AGO, THAT'S
10 LIFE; BUT I THINK FOR RIGHT NOW I WOULD HOPE THAT YOU GUYS
11 WOULD START WORKING ON SOME THAT ARE UP AT THE TOP OF THE
12 LIST.
13 MR. GOSSELIN: THE ABSOLUTE INTENT IS FOR US TO
14 START AT THE TOP AND WORK OUR WAY DOWN. AGAIN, WE'VE BEEN
15 DOING THAT WITH PROPARGITE AND ACTUALLY HAD PREPARED TO
16 REQUEST A.R.B. TO START MONITORING FOR THAT AND START
17 WORKING ON THAT AND THEN E.P.A. PULLED THE RUG OUT ON THE
18 REGISTRATION; BUT I THINK THAT'S ABSOLUTELY OUR INTENT TO
19 START AT THE TOP AND WORK OUR WAY DOWN.
20 DR. FRIEDMAN: OR IF YOU DON'T, GET SOME GOOD
21 EXPLANATION AS TO THE REASONS WHY.
22 MR. GOSSELIN: EXACTLY. YES.
23 DR. FROINES: CAN I NOW GO TO MY HEALTH EFFECTS
24 PART OF THIS DISCUSSION? THIS DOCUMENT HAS THREE

25 CATEGORIES THAT RELATE TO EXPOSURE. THEY BEGIN WITH VAPOR
0052
01 PRESSURE, SALES AND USE, AND HENRY'S CONCEPT; AND I THINK
02 IT'S GOOD TO HAVE EXPOSURE DATA AS ONE OF THE DRIVING
03 FACTORS; BUT WITH ONCOGENICITY WE HAVE A PROBLEM BECAUSE
04 WHAT WE HAVE IS NOT A MEASURE OF CARCINOGENIC POTENCY.
05 IT'S A QUESTION OF EVIDENCE.
06 SO IF E.P.A. HAS SAID IT'S PROBABLE OR
07 POSSIBLE, THAT'S A DIFFERENT LEVEL OF EVIDENCE. THAT'S A
08 LEVEL OF EVIDENCE THAT DEALS WITH THE QUALITATIVE
09 IDENTIFICATION OF A CHEMICAL. IT DOES NOT DEAL WITH THE
10 POTENCY OF THAT CHEMICAL, SO THAT ONE COULD HAVE A
11 PROBABLE CARCINOGEN THAT WAS EXTREMELY POTENT AND THAT
12 LOOKED TO BE A MAJOR HEALTH EFFECT THAT COULD HAVE MAJOR
13 HEALTH EFFECT POTENTIAL, BUT IT COULD HAVE NO DIFFERENT
14 RANKING THAN ONE THAT LOOKED LIKE SACCHARINE LOOKED.
15 AND SO WHAT YOU DON'T HAVE IN HERE IS ANY WAY
16 TO SAY THERE IS A REALLY DANGEROUS CHEMICAL THAT SHOULD
17 GET IMMEDIATE ATTENTION BECAUSE IT MAY KILL A LOT OF
18 PEOPLE. IT'S NOT JUST THE REGULATORY QUALITATIVE ISSUE OF
19 "YES OR NO, IS IT A CARCINOGEN OR NOT?" IT'S A QUESTION
20 OF, "IS THAT CHEMICAL GOING TO KILL A LOT OF PEOPLE?"
21 AND SO IT SEEMS TO ME THAT USING A
22 ONE-TO-FOUR CATEGORIZATION FOR ONCOGENICITY AND
23 CARCINOGENICITY, IS REALLY NOT -- THAT'S LESS
24 SOPHISTICATED THAN WHAT PEOPLE DID IN THE '70'S AND THAT
25 WE SHOULDN'T BE THERE. WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO LOOK AT THE
0053
01 LEVEL LIMIT.
02 NOW, THIS MORNING THE FIRST THING WE DID, WE
03 ALSO TALKED ABOUT THE RISK ASSESSMENT TASK FORCE AND
04 EVERYBODY'S GOING AROUND SMILING LIKE APPLE PIE,
05 MOTHERHOOD AND GOD, THAT WE ARE ALL IN FAVOR OF GOOD
06 SCIENCE. WELL, WE'VE ALWAYS BEEN IN FAVOR OF GOOD
07 SCIENCE.
08 I DON'T KNOW WHO'S DISCOVERED THE IMPORTANCE
09 OF GOOD SCIENCE, BUT IT SEEMS TO ME MOST OF US HAVE BEEN
10 DOING IT FOR 30 OR 40 YEARS, IF NOT LONGER; BUT IN THE
11 CONTEXT OF GOOD SCIENCE, I.A.R.C. HAS COME UP WITH A NEW
12 WAY OF LOOKING AT CARCINOGENS WHICH TAKES INTO ACCOUNT ALL
13 THE DATA, AND WHAT THEY SAY IS WHAT USED TO BE CALLED
14 GENOTOXICITY DATA IS NOW CONSIDERED TO HAVE RELEVANCE FOR
15 MECHANISM.
16 SO IF SOMETHING IS POSITIVE IN AN AIMS TEST
17 IN 1975 WOULD SEEM POSITIVE IN A GENETIC TOXICOLOGY TEST;
18 BUT NOW IF SOMETHING'S POSITIVE IN THE AIMS TEST, IT LOOKS
19 LIKE IT HAS POTENTIAL FOR MUTATIONS. SO NOW NOTHING'S
20 MAYBE CHANGED, BUT OUR INTERPRETATION HAS CHANGED AS WE
21 NOW UNDERSTAND A MORE BASIC CONTEXT.
22 SO IT SEEMS TO ME IF I.A.R.C. MOVES TO BEGIN
23 TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT OTHER DATA IN THEIR RANKING SCHEMES
24 FOR IDENTIFICATION PURPOSES THAT WE SHOULD BE USING MORE
25 DATA THAN WHAT E.P.A. IS DEVELOPING.
0054
01 AND IN TERMS OF POTENCY, THIS MAY MEAN THAT
02 ONE HAS TO DO SOME RISK ASSESSMENT TO SEE IF THE MATERIAL
03 COULD BE DANGEROUS. WHAT HAPPENS IS YOU'VE GOT THE ONE

04 CATEGORY THAT CLEARLY CAN BE SWAMPED BY ALL THE OTHER
05 CATEGORIES SO THAT IT SEEMS TO ME THAT ONE COULD SAY,
06 OKAY. SOMETHING -- WE MAY ONLY USE 75,000 POUNDS OF THIS
07 OR WHATEVER THE TERM, WHATEVER THE NUMBERS MAY TURN OUT TO
08 BE, TONS OR POUNDS, WHATEVER; BUT IF IT'S VERY, VERY
09 POTENT, YOU MAY WANT TO DEAL WITH SOMETHING THAT HAS
10 MEDIAN USE BUT MAY HAVE A MAJOR IMPACT.
11 AND SO THE PROBLEM WITH THIS RULE IS THAT IT
12 DOESN'T TAKE INTO ACCOUNT ANY LEVEL OF SOPHISTICATION
13 EXCEPT INSOFAR AS YOU SAY E.P.A. HAS DONE A REVIEW AND
14 THEREFORE THEY'VE LOOKED AT SOME OF THOSE ISSUES, BUT WE
15 KNOW WHAT A WEEK -- THAT'S WEEKLY DONE AT E.P.A.
16 SO I WOULD SAY WE NEED TO LOOK AT HOW DOES
17 THE N.O.E.L. AND ONCOGENICITY -- HOW CAN WE LOOK WITHIN
18 THAT AND IN MORE DEEPLY AND TRY AND PERHAPS RAISE SOME OF
19 THE RANKINGS OR TO DEVELOP PERHAPS AN ALGORITHM WHERE YOU
20 CAN SAY, "IF SOMETHING REACHES SO HIGH IN OUR SCHEME, THEN
21 IT GETS AN EXTRA NUMBER OR SOMETHING."
22 I MEAN, THERE NEEDS TO BE -- BECAUSE THIS IS
23 JUST TOO SIMPLE, FRANKLY, TO DEAL WITH A VERY COMPLEX
24 SCIENTIFIC ISSUE.
25 MR. GOSSELIN: AND I AGREE, AND I THINK YOUR POINT
0055
01 ABOUT USING ADMINISTRATIVE LISTINGS VERSUS SCIENTIFIC
02 LISTINGS IS VALID AND SOMETHING WE NEED TO GO BACK AND
03 LOOK AT; BUT YOUR SECOND POINT ABOUT THE BALANCE ISSUE IS
04 REALLY DIFFICULT BECAUSE I THINK DEPENDING ON THE SCHOOLS
05 OF THOUGHT YOU'RE ON BEFORE -- WHETHER IT'S HOW POTENT IS
06 THE HEALTH ENDPOINT AND HOW HAZARDOUS IS THIS TO PEOPLE
07 FROM EXPOSURE VERSUS, YOU KNOW, ARE WE GOING TO MEASURE
08 HOW MUCH -- YOU KNOW, FIND OUT IF THE MATERIALS THAT ARE
09 MOVING OUTSIDE THE MOST AND EXPOSING THE MOST PEOPLE OR AT
10 THE HIGHEST CONCENTRATION SO THAT THE ENVIRONMENTAL FATE
11 SIDE OF THINGS.
12 IT -- IT -- THERE -- I THINK THERE IS A
13 BALANCE THERE BASED ON JUDGMENT. IF SOMETHING IS A VERY
14 HIGH TOXIC LIKE YOU MENTIONED BUT NOT HIGHLY USED, THAT
15 NEEDS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT, AND I DON'T KNOW HOW YOU
16 COULD -- THAT'S WHY THIS ISN'T -- WE'VE GONE AROUND IN
17 CIRCLES AGAIN ON THIS.
18 THAT'S WHY I THINK TRYING TO DECIDE AND ALL
19 THIS IS -- THIS ISN'T A RISK ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT. IT'S
20 JUST A TOOL TO USE IN ORDER TO DECIDE WHICH MATERIALS
21 WE'RE GOING TO GO OUT AND MONITOR FROM. AND THE FACT THAT
22 YOU JUST LISTED OUT IS A CLEAR CASE THAT WOULD GO OUTSIDE
23 OF GOING DOWN A CLEAR ONE, TWO, THREE.
24 DR. FROINES: WELL, I AGREE THAT THESE ARE
25 COMPLICATED ISSUES. IN SOME CASES YOU CAN HAVE LOWER
0056
01 TOXICITY AND HIGHER USE, AND IN SOME CASES YOU CAN HAVE
02 VERY HIGH TOXICITY AND LOWER USE, I MEAN, TO GIVE TWO
03 EXTREMES; BUT WE HAVE TO SET UP A SYSTEM THAT LOOKS AT
04 THOSE TRADE-OFFS AND THEN SETS UP SOME METHOD FOR MAKING
05 DECISIONS AS OPPOSED TO WHAT YOUR DOCUMENT DOES, WHICH IS
06 NOT TO ADDRESS IT AT ALL.
07 MR. GOSSELIN: NO. THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT -- AGAIN,
08 IT'S A GUIDE. IT'S NOT A HARD AND FAST; BECAUSE AGAIN, WE

09 WOULD BE, I THINK, SOMEWHAT NEGLIGENT GOING OUT AND
10 MEASURING FOR SOMETHING THAT IS NO LONGER REGISTERED OR
11 ADJUSTMENTS THAT WE MADE OR SOMETHING DID NOT COME TO US,
12 A NEW -- AND THE WHOLE RISK ASSESSMENT AREA CHANGES AND
13 THEN HOW IT'S DEALT WITH.
14 IF THERE'S NEW EVIDENCE PRESENTED ON A
15 CERTAIN COMPOUND THAT'S LOWER ON THE LIST, THERE'S NO WAY
16 WE SHOULD HOLD OFF AND NOT MOVE THAT FORWARD IF IT WAS
17 HIGHLY USED AND IT HAD A PROPENSITY TO MOVE OUTSIDE, AND I
18 REALLY DON'T KNOW HOW YOU CAN REALLY PUT THAT IN A
19 DOCUMENT AND TAKE OUT SOME OF THOSE MANAGEMENT DECISIONS;
20 BUT I THINK THOSE THINGS ARE A PART OF THIS DOCUMENT AND
21 INTENDED TO BE SO YOU CAN LOOK AT ALL THE INFORMATION
22 THAT'S AVAILABLE AND MAKE THE BEST JUDGMENT ON WHICH
23 MATERIAL TO LOOK AT.
24 DR. SEIBER: WELL, I THINK YOU COULD -- WHAT YOU'RE
25 LOOKING FOR MAYBE, JOHN, IS A WAY TO OVERRIDE THE RANKING
0057
01 SCHEME WHEN THERE'S COMPELLING INFORMATION THAT A CHEMICAL
02 IS NUMBER 80. IT OUGHT TO MOVE UP TO NUMBER ONE AND I'M
03 SURE IT EXISTS. IT JUST ISN'T WRITTEN IN THIS DOCUMENT.
04 IF THERE'S D.E.F. TOX ON THE EDGE OF THE FIELD, YOU CAN BE
05 DARNED SURE THEY'RE GOING TO GO OUT AND DO SOMETHING.
06 THEY HAVE TO.
07 DR. FROINES: BUT IT GOES TO MY OTHER POINT.
08 THERE'S NO SCIENTIFIC DETERMINATION OF TOXICITY AND
09 POTENCY IN THIS DOCUMENT. IT SAYS WHATEVER E.P.A. SAYS,
10 WE'LL USE. WE WANT -- IF SOMEBODY CAME BEFORE US WITH
11 THAT DETERMINATION, WE'D LAUGH THEM OUT OF THIS ROOM
12 BECAUSE THE ONE THING THAT HAPPENS WITH GEORGE WHEN THEY
13 COME FORWARD IS THEY BRING VERY SOPHISTICATED SCIENTIFIC
14 RATIONALE; AND DIESEL IS GOING TO BE ONE OF THE MOST, IF
15 NOT THE MOST, SOPHISTICATED.
16 SO HERE WE ARE SAYING, WELL, GEE, E.P.A. GAVE
17 IT A B-1 AND THAT'S IT. THAT'S IT. AND I'M SAYING THAT
18 PERHAPS THAT'S NOT ADEQUATE.
19 MR. GOSSELIN: AND IF THIS WAS FOR A
20 DECISION-MAKING DOCUMENT, I'D ABSOLUTELY AGREE. THIS IS
21 JUST A CHOICE WITH THE FINITE SET OF DOLLARS WE HAVE, WHAT
22 ARE WE GOING TO SPEND OUR MONEY MONITORING FOR?
23 IN AN IDEAL WORLD, I'D LOVE TO HAVE DATA SETS
24 AND RISK ASSESSMENTS DONE ON THE ENTIRE LIST, AND THAT'S
25 FOR PESTICIDES THAT ARE -- YOU KNOW, TOXINS THAT ARE
0058
01 PURPOSELY PUT OUT INTO THE ENVIRONMENT, HAVING THAT SORT
02 OF DATA SET WOULD BE A LUXURY WE CAN'T AFFORD RIGHT NOW.
03 SO AS WE'RE SITTING HERE FROM A MANAGEMENT
04 STANDPOINT, WE'RE TRYING TO DECIDE, OKAY. WE HAVE X
05 NUMBER OF RESOURCES. WHAT CAN HE SPEND RIGHT NOW COMING
06 UP IN 1997?
07 DR. FRIEDMAN: WELL, I WONDER IF THERE'S A SIMPLE
08 COMPROMISE FOR PERHAPS A FUTURE DOCUMENT. I WONDER, FOR
09 EXAMPLE, IF WE COULD HAVE A RATING SYSTEM FOR ONCOGENICITY
10 THAT NOT ONLY INCLUDES THE PROBABILITY THAT IT IS A
11 CARCINOGEN, BUT SOME DEGREE OF THE POTENCY AND JUST HAVE
12 THAT BUILT INTO THE SCALE.
13 IS THAT -- LIKE, IS THAT -- IS IT -- JUST

14 HAVE A BREAKDOWN, MAYBE ONE OR TWO CUT POINTS, YOU KNOW,
15 AND THAT BUILT INTO YOUR SCALE. WOULDN'T THAT -- BECAUSE
16 I AGREE THAT THEY HAVE LIMITED RESOURCES FOR THIS SETTING
17 PRIORITIES AND THEY CAN'T SPEND ALL THE TIME ON THE VERY
18 SOPHISTICATED. I WONDER WHETHER THAT WOULD SATISFY YOU?
19 DR. FROINES: YEAH. I THINK SOMETHING LIKE THAT.
20 I THINK YOU OUGHT TO USE THE I.A.R.C. CRITERIA.
21 DR. PITTS: I WAS GOING TO SAY WHY DON'T YOU SEND A
22 LIST, "HERE ARE THE CRITERIA" AND YOU CAN HAVE A
23 FOLLOW-UP?
24 MR. GOSSELIN: THAT'S WHAT I SAID --
25 DR. PITTS: YOU SIMPLY HAVE THAT.
0059
01 MR. GOSSELIN: -- I FOUND THAT VERY COMPELLING
02 GETTING AWAY FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LISTING AND GOING TO
03 THAT OTHER LISTING THAT WE CAN GO BACK AND LOOK AT.
04 DR. PITTS: WELL, YOU CAN STILL PUT THIS LIST IN
05 THE FOLLOW-UP DOCUMENT AND HAVE THE CATEGORY, "HERE'S THE
06 I.A.R.C. CATEGORY. HERE'S THE E.P.A. CATEGORY. HERE THEY
07 ALL ARE" AND HAVE BOTH. "HERE THEY ARE" AND YOU'D HAVE
08 THE BACK-UP.
09 DR. FRIEDMAN: THAT DOESN'T GET THE POTENCY, ONLY
10 THE PROBABILITY.
11 DR. PITTS: OH, NO. THAT JUST'S, "HERE'S THE
12 RANKING."
13 DR. FRIEDMAN: BUT TO TRY TO JUST BUILD IN SOME
14 CRUDE CUT POINTS FOR POTENCY.
15 DR. PITTS: ABSOLUTELY. ABSOLUTELY.
16 MR. GOSSELIN: AND, AGAIN, I THINK IF AFTER LOOKING
17 AT SOME OF THE DOCUMENTS SOME OF THE COMPOUNDS AND SOME OF
18 THE THOUGHTS AND EXPERIENCES THAT YOU HAVE THAT, YOU KNOW,
19 YOU FEEL THAT WE DO NEED TO PICK SOMETHING UP TO TAKE A
20 LOOK AT, PLEASE LET US KNOW AND, YOU KNOW, THAT MIGHT BE
21 SOMETHING DEPENDING ON ITS USE WE CAN GO BACK AND LOOK AT
22 AND MAYBE KICK UP TO A HIGHER PRIORITY. SO IT IS AN OPEN
23 PROCESS TO TAKE IN BEST-AVAILABLE INFORMATION ON -- FROM
24 EVERYONE ON WHAT WE REALLY SHOULD BE MONITORING OUT THAT
25 FAR.
0060
01 DR. FROINES: WELL, LET ME JUST ASK YOU A QUESTION,
02 NOT TO PROLONG IT. ALACHLOR YOU HAVE IN HERE AS AVERAGING
03 AROUND 71,000 POUNDS A YEAR.
04 MR. GOSSELIN: RIGHT.
05 DR. FROINES: ANOTHER ONE I WAS INTERESTED IN,
06 OXADIAZON, WHICH IS ONLY AT 18,000, SO ALACHLOR IS MUCH --
07 A MUCH MORE USED COMPOUND AND THEN YOU HAVE SOME ONES THAT
08 ARE CLEARLY UP IN THE MILLIONS OF POUNDS AND -- BUT THE
09 TWO I MENTIONED, OXADIAZON AND ALACHLOR, BOTH HAVE A FOUR
10 AND A THREE IN TERMS OF THEIR TOXICITY SO -- AND
11 THEY'RE -- AND THEY'RE -- WHERE THEY RANK IS NOT BEING
12 OFFSET BY THIS ACUTE TOXICITY, WHICH I'M NOT SURE IS A
13 VERY GOOD MEASURE OF ANYTHING, QUITE FRANKLY; BUT THE --
14 SO THEY ARE COMPOUNDS THAT HAVE NOT A GREAT DEAL OF USE;
15 BUT THEY SEEM TO HAVE, ACCORDING TO YOUR LIST, SOME
16 TOXICITY AND THAT'S WHAT I'M SAYING.
17 THAT'S WHAT I'M SAYING. THAT'S WHERE YOU
18 NEED TO SAY, WELL, MAYBE WE OUGHT TO LOOK AT THOSE IF

19 THERE'S TOXICITY. AND ALACHLOR ISN'T A LOT; IT'S 75,000
20 POUNDS AND THAT'S NOT TERRIBLE. THAT'S FAIRLY SMALL,
21 RELATIVE TO SOME OF THE OTHERS, AND THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING
22 TO GET AT, IS THAT KIND OF TRADE-OFF.
23 DR. PITTS: I'VE GOT -- I'M MISSING SOMETHING
24 HERE. WHERE IS METHYL BROMIDE ON THE LIST?
25 MR. KELLEY: METHYL BROMIDE IS AHYDROUS. IT'S A
0061
01 T.A.C.
02 MR. GOSSELIN: IT'S ALREADY LISTED.
03 MR. KELLEY: AS A TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT.
04 DR. VANCE: IT'S IN APPENDIX A.
05 DR. PITTS: BUT THAT'S NOT ON THE LIST BECAUSE OF
06 THAT?
07 MR. GOSSELIN: RIGHT.
08 DR. PITTS: IF IT'S NOT ON THE LIST, IS THERE A
09 PROBLEM THAT MANAGEMENT OR OTHERS IN THE AREA COULD SIMPLY
10 LOOK AT THIS LIST AND NOT BE FULLY AWARE THAT
11 METHYL BROMIDE -- FOR EXAMPLE, I'D LIKE TO KNOW WHERE
12 METHYL BROMIDE IS.
13 MR. GOSSELIN: WHERE IS IT?
14 DR. PITTS: THAT WILL GIVE YOU SOME CALIBRATION.
15 ITS CALIBRATION. WHERE WOULD IT BE?
16 MR. KELLEY: WHEN I PRESENTED THIS DOCUMENT AS A
17 DRAFT FORM, I DID SHOW A SLIDE OF ALL THE HAZARDS, AIR
18 POLLUTANT TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS AND THEIR RANKING AND
19 EVERYTHING WOULD HAVE SHOWED UP IN MY HIGH PRIORITY, WHICH
20 MEANS THAT EVERYTHING HAD GREATER THAN 14 POINTS, ALL THE
21 CHEMICALS LISTED.
22 THAT WAS ALSO THE ONE WITH FORMALDEHYDE WHERE
23 I HAD ZERO POINTS FOR ONCOGENICITY, WHICH BROUGHT UP THAT
24 WHOLE CONSTRUCTION, WHICH IS WHY WE WENT TO THE E.P.A. AND
25 ADDED THAT. METHYL BROMIDE I THINK HAD 27 POINTS AND WAS
0062
01 NUMBER ONE.
02 DR. PITTS: NUMERO UNO.
03 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, THAT'S ENCOURAGING.
04 MR. GOSSELIN: WE THOUGHT SO.
05 MR. KELLEY: THAT WAS THE WHOLE --
06 DR. PITTS: THAT'S, AS A MATTER OF FACT, WHY IN
07 THIS ADDENDUM AND HOPEFULLY IN THE FOLLOW-UP DOCUMENT YOU
08 HOPEFULLY -- I THINK FOR A LOT OF REASONS, SCIENTIFIC,
09 RISK MANAGEMENT AND FOR THE GENERAL PUBLIC, THAT WOULD BE
10 USEFUL TO INSERT IN HERE THE ONES THAT ARE THE WINNERS.
11 PARATHION, WELL, THAT'S ONE AND THAT'S A WINNER.
12 YOU CAN ADD THEM ON THE BASIS OF BEING A -- A
13 T.A.C. ON THE BASIS OF ITS -- IT'S AN INERT AGENT AND YOU
14 KNOW THAT AND IT'S A BANDIT.
15 THESE WOULD BE -- THIS WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL
16 IN GETTING ACROSS TO A VERY BROAD AUDIENCE FROM VERY
17 TECHNICAL PEOPLE THAT YOU HAVE AROUND THE TABLE HERE TO
18 PEOPLE WHO HAVE TO DEAL WITH THE PUBLIC WHO ARE VERY
19 CONCERNED ABOUT A NUMBER OF THESE ISSUES, SO LET'S PUT
20 SOME WINNERS IN. THAT'S WHERE YOU REALLY ACHIEVE
21 SOMETHING.
22 DR. FROINES: ONE QUESTION AND THEN I'LL LEAVE
23 IT -- LET YOU OFF THE HOOK ON THIS. BECAUSE I SIT ON THE

24 CARCINOGEN IDENTIFICATION COMMITTEE AND WE GO THROUGH THIS
25 SOMETIMES CONTENTIOUS PROCESS OF LOOKING AT THE
0063
01 PRIORITIZATION OF CHEMICALS FOR IDENTIFICATION OF
02 CARCINOGENS AND THE STATE AND COUNTY E.P.A., O.E.H.H.A.
03 DOES A VERY NICE JOB OF LOOKING AT THOSE RANKINGS.
04 DO YOU AND THEY EXCHANGE INFORMATION BETWEEN
05 O.E.H.H.A. AND YOURSELVES? BECAUSE THEY ARE DOING A LOT
06 OF WORK THAT SEEMS TO ME WOULD DO WELL NOT TO GET REDONE
07 IN THE FUTURE.
08 MR. GOSSELIN: YEAH. WE HAVE PEER REVIEWS, OUR
09 RISK ASSESSMENTS AND OUR METHODOLOGY, AND THERE'S VERY
10 GOOD INTERACTION AND CONTACT WITH WHAT WE HAVE ON HEALTH
11 EFFECTS AND THE --
12 DR. FROINES: BUT DO YOU SHARE THE DATA BETWEEN THE
13 CARCINOGEN DATA AND YOUR PEOPLE?
14 MR. GOSSELIN: I'D ASSUME SO. IT'S NOT MY
15 DIVISION, BUT I'D BE SURPRISED IF THEY WEREN'T.
16 DR. PITTS: ARE THERE ANY --
17 DR. SEIBER: YES. I JUST HAD A COMMENT.
18 WERE YOU FINISHED WITH THAT? IT'S NOT REALLY
19 A QUESTION BECAUSE I KNOW IT DOESN'T HAVE ANY ANSWERS, BUT
20 WHEN PEOPLE LIVE IN A COMMUNITY, THEY'RE EXPOSED TO 15 OR
21 20 OR 50 OF THESE CHEMICALS ALL AT ONCE. IT'S NOT ANY ONE
22 CHEMICAL AT A TIME AND THERE'S A LOT OF INTEREST IN
23 MULTIPLE CHEMICAL SENSITIVITY OF THINGS OF THIS TYPE WHICH
24 I KNOW YOU'RE DEALING WITH.
25 AGAIN, I KNOW THERE'S NO ANSWER, BUT IT SEEMS
0064
01 TO ME AT SOME POINT WE'VE GOT TO START THINKING ABOUT
02 MULTIPLE EXPOSURES AND GET THAT INTO OUR EVALUATION OF
03 PESTICIDES AS TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS. HAVE YOU GIVEN ANY
04 THOUGHTS TO THAT?
05 MR. GOSSELIN: WELL, AS I TOLD YOU, MY KIND OF
06 STOCK ANSWER IS WE'RE STRUGGLING WITH DOING THESE AS A
07 ONE-BY-ONE BASIS AND THAT'S A JOKE ASIDE. BUT ONE THING
08 THAT IS KIND OF CHANGING THE WHOLE PESTICIDE RISK
09 ASSESSMENT SIDE IS THE NEW FOOD QUALITY PROTECTION ACT
10 THAT PRESIDENT CLINTON SIGNED IN AUGUST THAT WENT INTO
11 EFFECT. IT'S GOING TO DEAL WITH A COUPLE OF THINGS.
12 EVEN THOUGH IT'S DEALING WITH FOOD RESIDUES
13 AND DIETARY EXPOSURES, IT'S COUPLING IN ALL EXPOSURES FROM
14 ALL SCENARIOS, INCLUDING AIR EXPOSURES, WORKER EXPOSURES
15 AND HOUSEHOLD EXPOSURES.
16 AND SOME OF THOSE, IT'S REALLY PUSHING THE
17 ENVELOPE AND THEN PLUS IN DEALING WITH DIFFERENT CLASSES
18 OF O.P.'S AND CARBAMATES AS CUMULATIVE EXPOSURES AND ALSO
19 SUBGERMINALS START ENTERING INTO THE WHOLE ENDOCRINE END
20 OF THINGS, WHICH IS GOING TO BE YET ANOTHER LIST IN THE
21 MATRIX TABLE WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO ADD IN THE NEXT
22 DOCUMENT ON HOW THAT FACTORS IN.
23 BUT WHAT I THINK THEY'RE TALKING ABOUT IN
24 CONCEPT IS SOMETHING CALLED THE RISK CUP. FOR -- AND SORT
25 OF IN LUMPING IN CLASSES OF PESTICIDE COMPOUNDS LIKE THE
0065
01 O.P.'S IN ONE CLASS AND LOOKING AT CUMULATIVE CARCINOGENIC
02 EFFECTS AS PART OF THE RISK FACTORS.

03 SO WHEN YOU COME IN, WHETHER IT'S A DIETARY
04 USE OR NONE, THERE'S GOING TO LOOK AT THE OVERALL EXPOSURE
05 SCENARIO THAT PEOPLE ARE GOING TO GET FROM GROUNDWATER,
06 AIR, DIET AND THEN OCCUPATIONAL AND KEEP A RUNNING TOTAL
07 OF WHAT IS ACCEPTABLE. THIS IS GOING TO TURN ESSENTIALLY
08 THE THING -- THE WHOLE PROGRAM AT E.P.A. AND THE STATE ON
09 ITS HEAD AND THERE'S A LOT OF WORK COMING OUT ON THAT.
10 DR. FROINES: CAN I MAKE ONE COMMENT ABOUT THAT?
11 IT'S VERY INTERESTING. I'M GLAD JIM SAID IT BECAUSE I
12 SHOULD HAVE THOUGHT ABOUT IT. WE HAVE A $1.2 MILLION
13 GRANT FROM N.I.O.S.H. AND THE DEPARTMENT TO STUDY HOW ONE
14 DOES EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT FOR CHEMICAL EXPOSURES AND
15 IT'S -- IT'S QUITE COMPLICATED.
16 BOB SPEAR AT BERKELEY IS DEVELOPING SOME
17 MODELS AND WE'RE LOOKING AT ISSUES OF INTERNAL DOUBTS,
18 BECAUSE YOU CAN MEASURE -- WHAT YOU MEASURE IN THE AIR, AS
19 YOU WELL KNOW, IS SOMEWHAT DEFINED BY VAPOR PRESSURES AND
20 STUFF LIKE THAT, BUT WHEN IT GETS INTO YOUR BODY, OF
21 COURSE ALL KINDS OF OTHER THINGS HAPPEN AND THE
22 RELATIONSHIPS START TO CHANGE, ONE CHEMICAL TO ANOTHER.
23 SO WHAT ACTUALLY REACHES TARGET SITES MAY BE
24 DIFFERENT THAN WHAT ONE MEASURES IN THE AIR, SO THE WHOLE
25 ISSUE GETS TO BE PRETTY COMPLICATED FAST.
0066
01 ANYWAY, WE'RE TRYING TO IDENTIFY SOME
02 SAMPLING SITES WHERE YOU HAVE MULTIPLE EXPOSURES. WE
03 WOULD LIKE TO FIND SITES WHERE PEOPLE HAVE EXPOSURE --
04 OCCUPATIONAL EXPOSURES BELOW STANDARDS. WE'RE NOT
05 INTERESTED IN PROBLEMS.
06 MR. GOSSELIN: RIGHT.
07 DR. FROINES: WE'RE MORE INTERESTED IN HOW DOES ONE
08 LOOK AT EXPOSURE WHERE YOU HAVE, SAY, TWO, THREE, FOUR OR
09 FIVE CHEMICALS AND WE'D BE VERY INTERESTED, I THINK, IN
10 FINDING A COUPLE OF SITES WHERE YOU HAD SOME THINGS WHERE
11 WE COULD ACTUALLY COLLECT SOME DATA AND THEN COMPARE IT TO
12 THE MODELS THAT WE'VE BEEN DEVELOPING.
13 MR. GOSSELIN: GREAT. WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN,
14 LET'S SAY, A PESTICIDE MIXER WHO MIGHT BE HANDLING A
15 MULTIPLE NUMBER --
16 DR. FROINES: RIGHT.
17 MR. GOSSELIN: -- AND THEY WOULD BE COMPOSED TO
18 SOMETHING BELOW UNACCEPTABLE LEVELS BUT MIGHT BE EXPOSED
19 TO A VARIETY?
20 DR. FROINES: WE'RE MOSTLY INTERESTED IN ISSUES
21 THAT ARE ABOVE DETECTION LIMITS AND BELOW STANDARDS,
22 BECAUSE WHEN YOU GET -- IF YOU GET INTO PEOPLE BEING ABOVE
23 STANDARDS, THEN EVERYBODY'S NERVOUS AND SO YOU CAN'T DO
24 THE SCIENCE AS WELL.
25 IF THEY'RE BELOW THE STANDARDS, THEN YOU CAN
0067
01 LOOK AT HOW, CAUSE THE ISSUE IS A METHODOLOGIC ONE. HOW
02 DOES ONE DO THIS, ESPECIALLY FROM THE METHODOLOGY?
03 DR. PITTS: YOU HAVE ADDITIONAL --
04 MR. GOSSELIN: ONE QUICK PRESENTATION.
05 DR. PITTS: YES.
06 DR. KOLLMAN: MY NAME IS WYNETTA KOLLMAN.
07 MR. GOSSELIN: I THINK IT'S THE BUTTON ON THE TOP.

08 DR. PITTS: THERE YOU GO.
09 DR. KOLLMAN: THIS IS JUST SOME INFORMATION FOR
10 YOU ABOUT A DOCUMENT THAT'S COMING OUT. THIS IS NOT A
11 TECHNICAL DOCUMENT. IT'S WRITTEN FOR THE GENERAL PUBLIC.
12 IT SUMMARIZES ALL OF THE PESTICIDE AIR MONITORING DATA
13 THAT HAVE BEEN COLLECTED AND PUBLISHED REPORTS BY THE
14 CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD.
15 FROM 1986 TO 1995, A.R.B. CONDUCTED AMBIENT
16 AIR MONITORING FOR 20 PESTICIDES AND FIVE PRIMARY
17 PESTICIDE DESIGNATION PRODUCTS IN TEN COUNTIES. VOLUMES
18 ARE REPORTED AS THE MAXIMUM POSSIBLE DETECTIONS FOR EACH
19 CHEMICAL. THESE VALUES RANGE FROM 0.001 MICROGRAMS PER
20 CUBIC METER FOR METHYL PARATHION IN SUTTER COUNTY TO 161
21 MICROGRAMS PER CUBIC METER FOR 1,3 DICHLOROPROPENE.
22 APPLICATION SITE MONITORING FOR 17 PESTICIDES
23 AND FOUR PRIMARY PESTICIDE DEGRADATION PRODUCTS WAS
24 CONDUCTED IN 12 COUNTIES FROM 1986 TO 1995. THE HIGHEST
25 VALUES RANGE FROM 0.9 MICROGRAMS PER CUBIC METER FOR A
0068
01 METOLACHLOR APPLICATION TO COTTON IN FRESNO COUNTY TO
02 3,393 MICROGRAMS PER CUBIC METER FOR A METHYL BROMIDE
03 APPLICATION FOR STRAWBERRIES IN MONTEREY COUNTY. THOSE
04 ARE JUST THE SUMMARY TABLES.
05 MR. GOSSELIN: JUST TO --
06 DR. FROINES: CAN I SEE THE FIRST ONE AGAIN? THERE
07 WAS JUST ONE I GOT OFF --
08 MR. GOSSELIN: IF I CAN JUST -- THE DOCUMENT WE
09 JUST PRESENTED IN THIS AND THE SPECIFIC DOCUMENT YOU GET,
10 IT SORT OF FLOWS IN A PACKET WHERE THE DOCUMENT WE JUST
11 DISCUSSED IS SORT OF HOW WE GO OUT MONITORING, AND THIS
12 PRESENTS SOMETHING OF A FOLLOW-UP THAT US AND A.R.B.
13 WORKED ON; AND WE'RE GOING TO CONTINUE TO GET THIS
14 COMPILING OF THE MONITORING DATA IN SUMMARY FASHION AND
15 MAKE THAT MORE PUBLICLY ACCEPTABLE FOR PEOPLE TO KNOW WHAT
16 MONITORING DATA WE HAVE, AND THEN WE'RE GOING TO BE
17 HAVING -- THIS IS ALL CONCURRENT -- GETTING THE
18 SPECIFIC -- TAKE ALL THAT EXPOSURE DATA AND THEN PUT THE
19 SPECIFIC T.A.T. DATA DOCUMENTS TOGETHER FOR YOU TO REVIEW
20 AND FINALIZE. SO IT'S A MULTIFACETED FLOW OF INFORMATION.
21 DR. PITTS: BUT THIS PARTICULAR DOCUMENT YOU SHOWED
22 US, IS THIS YOUR CURRENT, THE LATEST DOCUMENT COMING OUT?
23 I DON'T WANT TO TRAP YOU, BECAUSE I -- NO MOUSETRAP.
24 METHYL BROMIDE WAS DATED 1986. THAT WAS TEN YEARS AGO FOR
25 THE MEASUREMENT AND I HAPPENED TO HAVE AN L.A. TIMES
0069
01 ARTICLE THAT WAS DONE THREE MONTHS AGO. MAJOR CONCERN.
02 DO YOU HAVE MORE RECENT DATA?
03 MR. GOSSELIN: YES. THIS IS A SUMMARY OF THE DATA
04 THAT --
05 DR. PITTS: I THOUGHT --
06 MR. GOSSELIN: YES. THAT IS A SUMMARY OF THE DATA
07 THAT -- OF THE ORIGINAL DATA THAT THE STATE ORIGINALLY
08 CONDUCTED. WE HAD THE INDUSTRY COME IN WITH ADDITIONAL
09 MONITORING. WE ARE NOT PRODUCING INDUSTRY DATA IN THIS
10 DOCUMENT.
11 DR. PITTS: SO THE LAST TIME THE STATE HAS MEASURED
12 METHYL BROMIDE IS IN 1986?

13 MR. GOSSELIN: NO. NO.
14 DR. SEIBER: THAT'S NOT REALLY RIGHT EITHER.
15 MR. GOSSELIN: NO.
16 DR. PITTS: I THINK IT WOULD BE VERY IMPORTANT.
17 IT WOULD SEEM TO ME IF YOU'RE GOING TO DO THIS AND PICK
18 YOUR KEY TARGET, THIS IS ONE -- THIS IS A BIGGIE, AS WE
19 ALL KNOW, FOR EVERYBODY'S INTERESTS AND THESE ARE THE
20 NUMBERS AND THESE ARE THE LATEST DATA AND HERE'S WHERE WE
21 TOOK THEM AND -- CAUSE OTHERWISE I SAW A '95 HERE AND
22 THERE, BUT I KNOW A GREAT DEAL MORE HAS BEEN DONE.
23 BUT IF ONE WERE JUST TO LOOK AT THIS AND GO
24 TO LOOK AT A FIVE-YEAR REQUEST FOR FUNDING AND IS GOING
25 BACK AND CITING THAT AS EVIDENCE, I THINK YOU'VE GOT TO BE
0070
01 VERY CAREFUL ABOUT THAT.
02 MR. GOSSELIN: YES. IT'S STILL UNDER REVIEW.
03 DR. PITTS: SO THIS IS NOT --
04 MR. GOSSELIN: NO.
05 DR. PITTS: THE MESSAGE IS --
06 MR. GOSSELIN: THIS IS JUST AN F.Y.I. THAT ALL THE
07 DATA THAT WE HAVE IN FROM A.R.B., WE'RE GOING TO BE --
08 THOSE DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE AND WE'VE WORKED WITH A.R.B.
09 ON SUMMARY TABLES ON LETTING PEOPLE KNOW WHERE THEY CAN
10 GET THAT, BUT ALSO HAVING SORT OF A COMPILATION REPORT
11 AVAILABLE FOR PEOPLE TO KNOW.
12 DR. PITTS: YOU'RE DOING THAT NOW THEN?
13 MR. GOSSELIN: YES.
14 DR. PITTS: SO THIS IS JUST -- THIS IS WHERE IT ALL
15 SORT OF BEGAN? THIS IS ALMOST HISTORICAL IN A SENSE --
16 MR. GOSSELIN: RIGHT.
17 DR. PITTS: -- AND YOU WILL TAKE THAT AND IT WILL
18 BE STATE OF THE ART?
19 MR. GOSSELIN: RIGHT.
20 DR. PITTS: WHEN DO YOU THINK THIS PAPER WILL BE
21 AVAILABLE? BETWEEN YOU AND THE A.R.B., WHAT'S YOUR
22 TIMETABLE?
23 MR. GOSSELIN: EARLY JANUARY.
24 DR. PITTS: NOW, SEE, THAT'S IMPORTANT. THAT'S
25 VERY GOOD.
0071
01 MR. GOSSELIN: IT'S ALL EXISTING DATA AND ONE OF
02 THE --
03 DR. PITTS: OKAY.
04 MR. GOSSELIN: IT'S NOTHING NEW, AND ONE OF THE
05 THING'S GOING BACK AND TAKING A LOOK AT THIS PROGRAM IS
06 THAT THE MONITORING DATA THAT A.R.B.'S DONE INTO THIS
07 PROGRAM FOR PESTICIDES FOR D.P.R. IS I REALLY THINK HELD
08 AS AN OLD SUCCESS STORY.
09 DR. PITTS: TALONE IS A CLASSIC EXAMPLE. THAT'S
10 WORLDWIDE. I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT WE RECOGNIZE THIS
11 WILL BE JANUARY, CAUSE I THINK SOME OF US ARE -- WE ARE
12 ONGOING AND ONGOING AND WE FIND YEARS LATER THAT IT'S
13 STILL ONGOING, BUT NOTHING DEFINITIVE HAS FINALLY
14 EMERGED. SOONER OR LATER WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO DECIDE,
15 THIS IS IT, SAY "FINE," WE'RE PUTTING IT OUT, AND WE'LL
16 UPDATE IT LATER.
17 DR. SEIBER: I THINK ABOUT A YEAR AGO -- STEVE LYNN

18 BAKER'S IN THE AUDIENCE HERE. HE AUTHORED AN ARTICLE THAT
19 WENT IN ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY THAT KIND OF
20 SUMMARIZED PRETTY MUCH THE SAME INFORMATION.
21 IS THAT CORRECT?
22 MR. BAKER: THAT'S CORRECT.
23 DR. SEIBER: SO THEY'RE MAKING AN EFFORT. THIS
24 MOUNTAIN OF DATA IS TO SHOW THE WORLD WHAT'S GOING ON.
25 DR. PITTS: ABSOLUTELY. THAT COULDN'T BE MORE
0072
01 USEFUL AND MORE TIMELY. THAT'S GREAT. ARE THERE ANY
02 OTHER QUESTIONS FROM THE PANEL?
03 ARE THERE ANY POINTS OR QUESTIONS YOU CARE TO
04 ASK US OR MAKE WITH US?
05 MR. GOSSELIN: I THINK WE COVERED ALL THE POINTS.
06 DR. PITTS: I THINK IT'S BEEN AN EXCELLENT
07 DISCUSSION. WE APPRECIATE YOUR BEING DOWN HERE.
08 MR. GOSSELIN: WE'LL HAVE TO COME BACK SOONER.
09 DR. PITTS: WE'LL GET TO THAT. I THINK IT'S A VERY
10 USEFUL AND EXCITING INTERACTION AND IT'S NICE TO SEE
11 THINGS COMING OUT THAT ARE VERY POSITIVE AND I APPRECIATE
12 THAT. SO THANK YOU.
13 I THINK WE'LL TAKE A TEN-MINUTE BREAK NOW.
14 (RECESS)
15 DR. PITTS: SHALL WE CALL THE SESSION BACK TO
16 ORDER? THE NEXT ITEM ON THE AGENDA IS AN UPDATE FROM THE
17 AIR RESOURCES BOARD AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
18 HAZARD ASSESSMENT STAFFS ON THE DRAFT DOCUMENT ON DIESEL
19 EXHAUST.
20 MS. DENTON: GOOD MORNING, DR. PITTS AND MEMBERS OF
21 THE PANEL. AT THE LAST S.R.P. MEETING, OCTOBER 31ST, YOU
22 ASKED FOR AN UPDATE OF WHERE WE ARE IN THE DIESEL
23 IDENTIFICATION PROJECT, SO THAT'S WHAT WE'RE HERE FOR
24 TODAY, AND THAT'S TO PROVIDE YOU WITH THAT UPDATE.
25 TO MY RIGHT IS ROBERT KRIEGER. HE'S THE LEAD
0073
01 PERSON ON THE EXPOSURE AND ROBERT WILL BE REVIEWING WHAT'S
02 INVOLVED IN PART A AND WHAT KINDS OF UPDATES WE ARE IN THE
03 PROCESS OF DOING ON PART A. AND THEN GEORGE WILL UPDATE
04 YOU ON THE ISSUES REGARDING THE PART B FOR DIESEL EXHAUST,
05 AND THEN WE ARE GOING TO HAVE -- OUR LAST PART WILL BE A
06 PROPOSED TIME LINE AT LEAST THROUGH THE RELEASE OF THE
07 NEXT VERSION OF THE DOCUMENT. SO WITH THAT, I WILL TURN
08 IT OVER TO ROBERT.
09 MR. KRIEGER: THANK YOU, JOAN.
10 GOOD MORNING, DR. PITTS AND MEMBERS OF THE
11 PANEL. IN MY NEXT FEW SLIDES, I'LL BE PROVIDING YOU A
12 BRIEF BACKGROUND ON THE DIESEL PROGRAM REVISIONS TO THE
13 PART A, OUR PRELIMINARY RISK ASSESSMENT FINDINGS FOR THE
14 EXPOSURE, AND UPDATE TO OUR DIESEL EXHAUST TOXICITY
15 STUDY.
16 AS YOU KNOW, DIESEL EXHAUST ENTERED THE
17 A.B. 1807 PROGRAM IN 1989. IN MARCH OF 1990, A.R.B.
18 SPONSORED A CONFERENCE ON THE RISK ASSESSMENT OF DIESEL
19 EXHAUST.
20 DR. PITTS: EXCUSE ME. YOU WILL PROVIDE THE PANEL
21 WITH COPIES OF THE OVERHEAD, WON'T YOU?
22 MR. KRIEGER: YES, WE WILL. WOULD YOU LIKE THOSE

23 RIGHT NOW?
24 DR. PITTS: OH, IF YOU HAVE COPIES. IF YOU HAVE, I
25 THINK THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL AS WE MOVE ALONG.
0074
01 MR. KRIEGER: OKAY.
02 DR. PITTS: THAT'S GREAT.
03 MR. KRIEGER: IN MARCH 1990, A.R.B. SPONSORED A
04 CONFERENCE ON THE RISK ASSESSMENT OF DIESEL EXHAUST OF
05 WHICH DR. PITTS WAS IN ATTENDANCE.
06 ON JUNE 17TH, 1994, OUR INITIAL DRAFT REPORT
07 WAS RELEASED TO THE PUBLIC FOR A SIX-MONTH COMMENT PERIOD
08 AND PUBLIC BRIEFING. WE HELD OUR FIRST WORKSHOP ON
09 SEPTEMBER 14TH, 1994. AND ON JANUARY 29TH AND 30TH OF
10 THIS YEAR, A.R.B., O.E.H.H.A., H.E.I., N.I.O.S.H., W.H.O.
11 AND THE U.S. E.P.A. SPONSORED A WORKSHOP ON THE HUMAN
12 HEALTH STUDY.
13 WE ARE CURRENTLY REVISING THE JUNE 1994 DRAFT
14 TO REFLECT COMMENTS WE HAVE RECEIVED ON OUR REPORT. WE
15 ARE DOING THIS BY INCLUDING ADDITIONAL STUDIES FROM OTHER
16 AIR BASINS, UPDATING OUR POPULATION CENSUS DATA AND
17 INCORPORATING AN UPDATED EMISSIONS INVENTORY.
18 WE ARE ALSO ADDING AN INDOOR AND TOTAL
19 EXPOSURE ANALYSIS SECTION TO THE REPORT. WE ARE ALSO
20 ADDING ANOTHER NEAR-SOURCE EXPOSURE ANALYSIS TO THAT
21 REPORT AS WELL AND AN ESTIMATE OF FUTURE AMBIENT EXPOSURE
22 ESTIMATES BASED ON OUR EMISSIONS INVENTORY ON CURRENT AND
23 FUTURE EXPOSURES.
24 OUR PRELIMINARY EXPOSURE FINDINGS, AS YOU
25 KNOW, DIESEL EXHAUST IS A COMPLEX MIXTURE OF GASSES,
0075
01 VAPORS AND FINE PARTICLES. EMISSIONS OF DIESEL EXHAUST
02 HERE IN CALIFORNIA ARE ESTIMATED TO BE ABOUT 54,000 TONS
03 PER YEAR. OF THESE EMISSIONS, AUTO OR MOTOR VEHICLE
04 CONTRIBUTED ABOUT 73 PERCENT, OTHER MOBILE SOURCES
05 CONTRIBUTED ABOUT 24 PERCENT, AND STATIONARY SOURCES
06 CONTRIBUTED THE REMAINING 3 PERCENT.
07 OUR ORIGINAL AMBIENT CONCENTRATIONS OF 3.7
08 MICROGRAMS PER CUBIC METER WILL BE UPDATED ON THE
09 INFORMATION FROM THE PREVIOUS SLIDES AND FROM THE NEW
10 EMISSIONS INVENTORY. WE WILL ALSO BE PROVIDING A TOTAL
11 EXPOSURE INFORMATION CONCENTRATION AS WELL AS A INDOOR
12 ANALYSIS.
13 WE HAVE ESTIMATED THAT A FREEWAY IN L.A. TO
14 BE UP TO THREE TIMES THAT OF OUTDOOR AMBIENT EXPOSURES, SO
15 WE HAVE THAT ESTIMATE IN OUR REPORT AS WELL.
16 FINALLY --
17 DR. FROINES: WAS THAT A STATEWIDE WEIGHTED
18 AVERAGE?
19 MR. KRIEGER: THE 3.7 STATEWIDE AVERAGE IS.
20 FINALLY, WE HAVE INCLUDED THE BENEFITS FROM THE CURRENT
21 DIESEL EXHAUST P.M. CONTROLS, AND THOSE BENEFITS REFLECT A
22 50 PERCENT IN P.M. FROM 1990 TO 2010.
23 DR. FRIEDMAN: EXCUSE ME. WHAT DOES "P.M." MEAN?
24 MR. KRIEGER: PARTICULATE MATTER.
25 DR. PITTS: EXCUSE ME. WHY DON'T WE JUST ASK
0076
01 QUESTIONS AS WE GO ALONG, IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS THAT

02 ARISE.
03 NOW, I WOULD BE INTERESTED IN THE P.M. 10
04 BENEFITS. THERE'S BEEN A 50-PERCENT REDUCTION. YOU HAVE
05 FROM 1990 TO 2010. WHAT'S HAPPENED BETWEEN 1990 AND
06 1996? HAVE THERE BEEN SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS DURING THAT
07 PERIOD?
08 MR. KRIEGER: ACTUALLY, MOST OF THE REDUCTIONS HAVE
09 OCCURRED FROM 1990 TO 1996 BECAUSE OF THE NEW P.M.
10 REGULATIONS AS FAR AS VEHICLES, ENGINE REGULATIONS TO
11 DIESEL.
12 DR. PITTS: SO THEY'VE ALREADY OCCURRED?
13 MR. KRIEGER: MOST OF THEM HAVE ALREADY OCCURRED.
14 DR. PITTS: SO THOSE ARE SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS.
15 AND SO YOU MIGHT SAY A SIGNIFICANT FRACTION OF THAT HAS
16 ALREADY OCCURRED?
17 MR. KRIEGER: YES.
18 DR. PITTS: I THINK THAT'S A VERY IMPORTANT POINT.
19 THIS IS 1996 AND THE DIESEL FLEET'S RUNNING AND THE
20 PUBLIC'S USING THE FUEL AND SO THE A.R.B. BY PUTTING IN
21 THIS REGULATION IN 1990 HAS NOW ACHIEVED OVER SIX YEARS A
22 SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION IN SOMETHING THAT HAS ONLY RECENTLY
23 BEEN RECOGNIZED AS A MAJOR HEALTH PROBLEM, P.M. 10.
24 PRIOR TO P.M. 10 BECOMING A MAJOR ISSUE, THE
25 A.R.B. HAD A PROGRAM WHICH IS ALREADY EFFECTIVE IN
0077
01 REDUCING LEVELS OF ASPIRABLE PARTICLES AND
02 MICROPARTICLES. WHY DON'T WE --
03 DR. SEIBER: JUST A POINT OF CLARIFICATION, JIM.
04 IS THAT P.M. 10 OR IS THAT P.M. 2.5? WHAT'S THE OVERALL?
05 DR. PITTS: I'LL BET IT'S DIESEL.
06 MR. KRIEGER: IT'S MOSTLY P.M. 2.5 OR LESS, BUT FOR
07 OUR EMISSIONS INVENTORY, IT WAS P.M. 10.
08 DR. FRIEDMAN: AND WHAT DID THE REGULATION DO? PUT
09 SOME KIND OF DEVICE ON TRUCKS THAT CHANGED THE EXHAUST?
10 MR. KRIEGER: ACTUALLY, WE HAVE THE EMISSIONS
11 STANDARDS FOR THE TRUCK, HOW MUCH OF A PARTICULAR EMISSION
12 IS GOING TO BE EMITTED FROM EACH ENGINE IN A VEHICLE YEAR.
13 DR. FRIEDMAN: AND HOW IS THAT CONTROLLED? HOW DID
14 YOU ACHIEVE THE REDUCTION IN THE PAST SIX YEARS?
15 MR. KRIEGER: IN THE PAST SIX YEARS, WE HAVE --
16 SPECIFICALLY ON THE EMISSIONS REDUCTION OR SPECIFIC
17 EMISSIONS CONTROLS ON EACH VEHICLE, A LIGHT-DUTY EMISSIONS
18 CONTROL. WE HAVE THE DIESEL FUEL REGULATION THAT HAPPENED
19 IN 1993 THAT'S ACHIEVED A CERTAIN PERCENT OF EMISSIONS
20 P.M. REDUCTION.
21 DR. FRIEDMAN: BUT I KNOW IN GASOLINE WE HAVE A
22 CATALYTIC CONVERTER. WHAT IS DONE TO THE DIESEL EXHAUST?
23 MR. SCHEIBLE: I'M MIKE SCHEIBLE. I'M DEPUTY
24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER AT AIR RESOURCES BOARD.
25 VIRTUALLY ALL THE EMISSIONS FROM DIESEL
0078
01 ENGINES HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED BY ADDING ENGINE REDESIGN.
02 IT'S NOT THE USE OF TRAPS OR ADD-ON EQUIPMENT. THAT WAS
03 THE ROUTE WHEN WE ADOPTED THE REGULATION WE THOUGHT WOULD
04 BE TAKEN, BUT AUTO MANUFACTURERS HAVE FIGURED OUT OTHER
05 WAYS OF MEETING IT WITHOUT PUTTING ON ADD-ON CONTROLS.
06 WHAT THEY'VE DONE IS THEY'VE IMPROVED HOW THE

07 FUEL IS HANDLED AND THE METER AND THE BASIC ENGINE, SO
08 LESS PARTICULATES COME OUT THE BACK. AND WHAT WE'RE
09 SEEING SINCE A LOT OF THE TRUCKS TURN OVER PRETTY FAST IN
10 TERMS OF MILEAGE -- THE FIRST YEARS THEY RUN A FEW YEARS.
11 DR. FRIEDMAN: SO A LOT OF ENGINES HAVE BEEN
12 REPLACED DURING THAT PERIOD?
13 MR. SCHEIBLE: RIGHT. AND DURING THE SAME TIME
14 THERE WAS AN INCENTIVE FOR FUEL ECONOMY ALSO TO REPLACE
15 YOUR ENGINE ALSO. SO IF YOU HAVE A HIGH-MILEAGE TRUCK
16 WHICH YOU HAD OPERATED FOR MANY HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF
17 MILES YOU GOT A FUEL ECONOMY BENEFIT OUT OF IT.
18 DR. PITTS: THANK YOU.
19 DR. FROINES: IN THE DOCUMENT THAT I HAVE IN THE
20 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, O.E.H.H.A. USES 2.2 MICROGRAMS PER
21 CUBIC METER AND YOU'RE USING 3.7.
22 MR. KRIEGER: OKAY. THAT 2.2 MICROGRAMS PER CUBIC
23 METER IS A PART OF OUR TOTAL EXPOSURE ANALYSIS AND THAT'S
24 GOING TO BE INCLUDED IN OUR NEXT DRAFT VERSION. THIS IS A
25 DRAFT VERSION AND I BELIEVE THEY HAVE THAT NUMBER FOR US.
0079
01 IT WAS A DRAFT NUMBER FROM US FOR THE NEXT VERSION, SO
02 THAT'S THE DIFFERENCE. IT'S INCORPORATING IN A TOTAL
03 EXPOSURE ANALYSIS.
04 DR. GLANTZ: SO WHAT'S THE CORRECT NUMBER? I'M
05 CONFUSED.
06 MR. KRIEGER: THE CORRECT NUMBER -- THIS NUMBER OF
07 3.7 IS OUR ORIGINAL NUMBER THAT WAS IN OUR REPORT AND
08 THAT'S JUST BASED ON OUTDOOR EXPOSURE IF YOU WERE EXPOSED
09 FOR 24 HOURS TO OUTDOOR AMBIENTS. THE 2.2 IS AN
10 INTEGRATED TOTAL EXPOSURE NUMBER WHICH INCLUDES AN
11 EXPOSURE TO OUTDOOR AND INDOOR EXPOSURES, INCLUDING INDOOR
12 ENVIRONMENTS; AND SO IT'S MORE OF A TOTAL EXPOSURE OF WHAT
13 A PERSON WOULD BE EXPOSED TO NOT JUST OUTDOORS BUT INDOORS
14 AS WELL, AND THAT PART OF THE NUMBER IS GOING TO BE IN OUR
15 NEXT DRAFT VERSION.
16 OKAY. FINALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO GIVE YOU A
17 BRIEF UPDATE ON THE C.E.-C.E.R.T. DIESEL EXHAUST RESEARCH
18 PROJECT. ACTUALLY, IT'S ONGOING RIGHT NOW, BUT IT'S TO
19 TEST OLD PRE-1993 AND NEW REFORMULATED DIESEL FUELS TO
20 COMPARE THE CHEMICAL COMPOSITION OF THE DIFFERENT FUELS.
21 C.E.-C.E.R.T. HAS ESTABLISHED A TECHNICAL ADVISORY
22 COMMITTEE AND OTHER SUBCOMMITTEES TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL
23 ASSISTANCE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS STUDY.
24 TESTING BEGAN DECEMBER 2ND OF THIS YEAR AND
25 PRELIMINARY RESULTS WILL BE AVAILABLE IN THE SUMMER OF
0080
01 1997.
02 THIS CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION AND IF THERE
03 ARE NO OTHER QUESTIONS --
04 DR. PITTS: NO. I THINK THERE MAY BE QUESTIONS.
05 DR. FROINES: THAT'S GREAT. THIS CONCLUDES MY
06 PRESENTATION. IF THERE ARE NO QUESTIONS --
07 DR. PITTS: TIME OUT. NOW, LET'S GO AHEAD AND --
08 YES?
09 DR. SEIBER: WELL, I HAVE A COMMENT ABOUT DATES AND
10 TIMING GOING BACK TO THE FIRST OVERHEAD.
11 DR. PITTS: WOULD YOU PUT THE FIRST OVERHEAD ON,

12 BACK TO THE ROARING '90'S.
13 DR. SEIBER: THE INTRODUCTION BACKGROUND THAT HAD
14 ALL THE DATES ON IT, I MEAN, IT STARTED IN 1989 AND WE'RE
15 JUST ABOUT IN THE 1997 NOW. SO I GUESS THE OVERALL TENOR
16 OF MY COMMENT IS HOW CAN WE MOVE THIS ALONG A LITTLE BIT
17 FASTER? THIS JUST SEEMS LIKE AN AWFULLY SLOW PROCESS.
18 FOR EXAMPLE, THE DRAFT REPORT IS RELEASED IN
19 1994 FOR A SIX-MONTH COMMENT ON IN. THIS WAS STILL IN
20 1994, AND THEN WE HAD A WORKSHOP -- OUR LAST PUBLIC
21 WORKSHOP -- ALMOST A YEAR AGO. I'M ASSUMING WHATEVER
22 COMMENT WAS INVOLVED THERE MUST HAVE TAKEN PLACE BY NOW
23 AND WE HEARD THAT C.E.-C.E.R.T. IS DOING A STUDY.
24 I THINK THAT'S GOOD, BUT I HOPE WE DON'T HAVE
25 TO JUST KEEP WAITING FOR ONE STUDY AFTER ANOTHER BEFORE WE
0081
01 CAN ACTUALLY TAKE SOME ACTION THERE. IT'S REALLY A
02 QUESTION OF TIMELINESS.
03 DR. PITTS: NOW, THE C.E.-C.E.R.T. STUDY IS NOT A
04 STUDY IN EPIDEMIOLOGY BUT THE CRISIS -- THE CRUX OF THE
05 DOCUMENT, ISN'T IT? IS IT, GEORGE, BASICALLY? I SEE THE
06 DISTINCTION OF THE DISCUSSION. THAT'S A QUESTION OF THE
07 COMPOSITION OF THE FUEL, THE MUTANICITY. ARE THEY DOING
08 ANY HUMAN CELL MUTANICITY ON THAT?
09 MS. DENTON: DR. PITTS THIS IS REALLY -- THERE'S
10 REALLY NO MUTANICITY SUPPLIED ON THIS STUDY. IT'S NOT AN
11 EPI STUDY; IT'S BASICALLY TO COMPARE THE FINGERPRINT OF
12 THE TWO FUELS.
13 DR. PITTS: JUST A CHEMICAL COMPOSITION? THAT'S
14 ALL?
15 MS. DENTON: THAT'S CORRECT. AND WE WERE GOING TO
16 SAVE THIS TO THE END; BUT IF YOU LIKE, WE CAN GO STRAIGHT
17 TO THE TIME LINE AND TELL YOU WHAT THE PROPOSED TIME LINE
18 IS AND -- OKAY.
19 DR. PITTS: GO AHEAD. IT WILL ANSWER JIM'S
20 QUESTION. WE MIGHT GO BACK TO JIM'S QUESTION HERE.
21 MS. DENTON: BASICALLY, AT THIS POINT, WE ALONG
22 WITH O.E.H.H.A. ARE REVISING OUR PROPERTIES TO REFLECT
23 COMMENTS, AND THE MAJOR ISSUES ARE THE HEALTH ISSUES.
24 OURS ARE FAIRLY STRAIGHTFORWARD AND WE'RE IN THE PROCESS
25 NOW OF UPDATING OUR DOCUMENT TO INCLUDE THE NEW EMISSIONS
0082
01 INVENTORY AND WE HAVE BASICALLY RESPONDED TO THE COMMENTS,
02 THE FIRST COMMENT PERIOD.
03 SO IT'S REALLY THE HEALTH ISSUES WHICH WERE
04 DISCUSSED IN JANUARY, AND IN A MOMENT I'LL TURN IT OVER TO
05 GEORGE; BUT AT THIS POINT, WE'RE REVISING OUR RESPECTIVE
06 REPORTS. WE'RE UPDATING OUR REPORT TO INCLUDE THE NEW
07 EMISSIONS INVENTORY. WE ANTICIPATE RELEASING THE NEXT
08 DRAFT VERSION OF THE REPORT NEXT SPRING WITH A PUBLIC
09 WORKSHOP IN THE SUMMER.
10 DR. GLANTZ: IS THE GOAL TO TAKE TEN YEARS TO
11 FINISH THIS?
12 MS. DENTON: MY GOAL IS NOT TO TAKE TEN YEARS, SO I
13 THINK I'LL TURN IT OVER TO GEORGE.
14 DR. PITTS: NOT YET. NOT YET. I -- DON'T GIVE IT
15 TO GEORGE YET --
16 MS. DENTON: AS FAR AS THE TIME LINE.

17 DR. PITTS: -- AS FAR AS PART A.
18 DR. FROINES: CAN -- I SEE THE PROBLEM AS WE HAVE A
19 RELEASED -- A REVISED DRAFT REPORT IN SPRING OF '97
20 FOLLOWED BY A PUBLIC WORKSHOP. NOW, S.R.P. STILL HAS NOT
21 GOTTEN A FORMAL DOCUMENT YET AND HERE'S MY QUESTION.
22 AT THE END OF THE PUBLIC WORKSHOP, YOU'RE
23 GOING TO HAVE A LOT OF COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS THAT PEOPLE
24 HAVE HAD SO THEN YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE TO GO BACK AND THEN
25 YOU'RE GOING TO MAKE SOME CHANGES IN THE REPORT, PERHAPS,
0083
01 BASED ON THE PUBLIC WORKSHOP. THEN YOU WILL RELEASE
02 ANOTHER DRAFT AND THEN GET COMMENTS BACK ON THAT AND THEN
03 IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THAT'S WHEN WE WOULD GET IT, BUT IT
04 SEEMS TO ME THAT THAT'S A PROCESS THAT COULD TAKE US WELL
05 INTO 1998.
06 MS. DENTON: YOU'RE RIGHT, DR. FROINES. THIS
07 VERSION IS NOT THE S.R.P. VERSION WHICH WE WILL -- WHICH
08 WE WILL ASK YOU TO REVIEW FORMALLY. THIS NEXT VERSION
09 WILL BE SIMPLY THE RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS.
10 NOW, IF COMMENTS COME BACK THAT CAUSE US TO
11 SIGNIFICANTLY CHANGE APPROACHES OR IF THERE'S, YOU KNOW,
12 SUBSTANTIAL CHANGES, THEN THERE, IN FACT, COULD BE ANOTHER
13 VERSION OF THE REPORT THAT WE WOULD RELEASE. BUT AT THIS
14 POINT, THE PLAN IS THAT AFTER THIS NEXT DRAFT REPORT AND
15 COMMENTS ARE COMPLETED, THEN THAT VERSION WOULD BE THE ONE
16 THAT WE WOULD SUBMIT TO THE PANEL.
17 DR. FROINES: I SHOULD SAY ONE THING AND THIS IS A
18 NASTY COMMENT I MIGHT AS WELL MAKE AND LEAVE IT AT THAT.
19 WHEN YOU GO THROUGH THE CALCULATIONS WHICH ARE IN THE
20 DOCUMENT THAT I'M REVIEWING AND YOU TAKE THE RISK
21 ASSESSMENT AND THE EXPOSURE LEVELS, YOU'RE TALKING PERHAPS
22 AS HIGH AS 200,000 CASES OF CANCER OVER A LIFETIME SO THAT
23 THERE'S A MAJOR PUBLIC HEALTH ISSUE HERE AND THE LONGER WE
24 KIND OF KICK THIS AROUND, PEOPLE'S LIVES ARE BEING
25 AFFECTED BY THAT. SO THIS ISN'T A TRIVIAL ISSUE.
0084
01 AND HAVING SAID THAT COMMENT, WHICH IS NOT
02 INTENDED TO BE CRITICAL OF ANY INDIVIDUAL -- IT'S JUST
03 MEANT AS A COMMENT OF A PROBLEM WE HAVE HAD BEFORE -- WHAT
04 ARE THE IMPLICATIONS OF E.P.A.'S P.M. 2.5 STANDARD ON THIS
05 PROCESS? WHERE DOES ALL THAT FIT INTO THIS?
06 DR. PITTS: YEAH. WHERE DOES IT -- AND ALONG WITH
07 THAT LINE, WHERE IS P.M. 2.5? IS THAT DISCUSSED IN DETAIL
08 IN THE HEALTH RISK HERE? OR P.M. 10? WE RAISED THAT
09 QUESTION AT THAT CONFERENCE IN SAN FRANCISCO A YEAR AGO.
10 THAT IS, WHAT ARE REALLY THE RISKS? ARE THEY REALLY RISKS
11 IN TERMS OF EPIDEMIOLOGY OR IS IT A FACTOR OF THE
12 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE E.P.A., SAY, AND THE AIR RESOURCES
13 BOARD NUMBERS OR O.E.H.H.A.'S NUMBERS? AND WE DISCUSSED
14 THAT EPIDEMIOLOGY AS A KEY ISSUE.
15 IS P.M. 10 TREATED COMPLETELY -- I GLANCED AT
16 THIS. I SAW P.M. 10 IN THE EXPOSURE SIDE. YOU TREATED
17 P.M. 10 IN THE EXPOSURE. IS THAT TREATED IN THE EFFECTS
18 SIDE, GEORGE, SPECIFICALLY AS THAT?
19 DR. ALEXEEFF: ONLY SLIGHTLY.
20 DR. PITTS: BUT ISN'T THAT THE MAIN -- IS THAT THE
21 DRAFT THAT HAS THE PROBLEMS STEMMING FROM -- IS THAT WHAT

22 YOU'RE ASKING?
23 DR. FROINES: NO. THIS 150,000 IS LUNG CANCER
24 CASES. IT DOESN'T EVEN DEAL WITH THE NONMALIGNANT
25 RESPIRATORY ISSUES, SO HE HAS ANOTHER LARGE NUMBER OF
0085
01 DEATHS ASSOCIATED WITH THAT.
02 DR. PITTS: THAT'S WHAT I WAS GOING TO SAY. I
03 DON'T UNDERSTAND -- MY KEY QUESTION HAS BEEN FOR THE LAST
04 THREE YEARS THAT WE'VE DISCUSSED THIS, WHY ARE WE NOT
05 ADDRESSING BOTH THE -- I THINK P.M. 10 IS LESS
06 CONTROVERSIAL IN A SENSE THAN THE EPIDEMIOLOGY THAT WE
07 HEARD ABOUT IN SAN FRANCISCO, WHICH WAS HIGHLY
08 CONTROVERSIAL.
09 SO WHY ARE WE NOT TREATING IN DETAIL THE
10 ISSUE WHICH IS APPARENTLY, AT LEAST FROM WHAT I CAN SEE AS
11 A SIMPLE ATMOSPHERIC CHEMIST WHO DOESN'T UNDERSTAND ALL
12 THIS ENVIRONMENTAL EPIDEMIOLOGIST STUFF -- IT SEEMS TO ME
13 THE MAJOR THREAT AS WE SEE IN THE SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE
14 WOULD BE P.M. 10, NOT THAT THE OTHERS, NOT THAT THE
15 CARCINOGENS, NOT THAT THE NITROAERINS (PHONETIC) WHICH
16 HAVE JUST BEEN IDENTIFIED BY THE C.E.C. HAS HUMAN -- HAS
17 PROBABLE HUMAN CARCINOGENS. THAT JUST CAME OUT.
18 DR. ALEXEEFF: WELL, MY NAME IS GEORGE ALEXEEFF,
19 FROM THE OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD
20 ASSESSMENT.
21 THE P.M. WORK IS ACTUALLY DONE UNDER A
22 DIFFERENT PROGRAM. IT'S DONE UNDER THE CRITERIA AIR
23 POLLUTANT PROGRAM. SO UNDER THAT PROGRAM, MY STAFF WORKS
24 WITH THE RESEARCH DIVISION, AND IN THE PAST WE HAVE A
25 SEPARATE ADVISORY PANEL THAT WE PREPARE REPORTS FOR ON
0086
01 AMBIENT QUALITY STANDARDS AND SUBMIT TO THEM FOR REVIEW
02 AND THEN IT GOES TO THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD.
03 SO WE HAVE IN THE PAST SUBMITTED REPORTS ON
04 P.M. 10 IN THIS CASE AND THERE IS A STATE HEALTH STANDARD
05 WHICH IS MORE STRINGENT THAN THE FEDERAL HEALTH STANDARD.
06 CURRENTLY WHAT IS HAPPENING IS, AS YOU'RE PROBABLY AWARE,
07 THE FEDERAL E.P.A. IS FINALIZING ITS P.M. REPORT AND OZONE
08 REPORTS AND WE AS AN AGENCY, CAL/E.P.A. -- THAT'S A.R.B.
09 THAT IS THE LEAD ON THIS, AND WE ARE ASSISTING THE
10 RESEARCH DIVISION OF THE A.R.B. IN PREPARING COMMENTS TO
11 RESPONSES TO THE U.S. E.P.A. PROCESS.
12 SO RIGHT NOW, WE ARE PRIMARILY WORKING AS AN
13 AGENCY IN RESPONDING TO U.S. E.P.A. AND TRYING TO GIVE
14 THEM ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SO THAT THEY COME UP WITH, YOU
15 KNOW, AN APPROPRIATE STANDARD OR STANDARDS.
16 IN OUR DIESEL EXHAUST REPORT, WE ONLY BRIEFLY
17 DISCUSS P.M. AND WE REFER PRIMARILY TO THIS U.S. E.P.A.
18 REPORT WHICH IS THE MOST RECENT REVIEW OF P.M. THAT'S
19 AVAILABLE.
20 DR. FROINES: BUT IF THE -- WELL, SINCE E.P.A.'S
21 UNDER COURT ORDER, PRESUMABLY IN JUNE THAT STANDARD WILL
22 GO INTO EFFECT. IN THE CONTROL PHASE THEN, PRESUMING
23 DIESEL WILL BE ONE OF THE ISSUES THAT WILL HAVE TO BE
24 ADDRESSED IN TERMS OF CONTROL OF REDUCING PARTICULARS?
25 MR. SCHEIBLE: WELL, IT WILL IF A -- SAY AN ANNUAL
0087

01 P.M. 10 OR P.M. 2.5 STANDARD IS SET AT THE LEVEL OF 15
02 POINT MICROGRAMS, THE DIESEL CONTRIBUTION WILL BE VERY
03 IMPORTANT. IF THE AMBIENT WAS 3.7 MICROGRAMS, THAT'S
04 DIRECTLY ADMITTED PARTICULATES AND THAT'S A SIZEABLE
05 PORTION PLUS THE ROLE OF THE N.O.C.'S (PHONETIC) EMISSIONS
06 FROM DIESELS FORMING NITRATES WHICH ACCOUNT FOR ABOUT HALF
07 OF THE P.M. 2.5 IN AREAS LIKE THE L.A. BASIN.
08 SO IF WE GET A P.M. 2.5 STANDARD AT A LEVEL
09 THAT'S FAIRLY STRINGENT, CAUSE OF THE CONTROL PROGRAM, WE
10 WILL HAVE TO LOOK AT DIESELS AND SAY, "WHAT ARE WE DOING
11 NOW?" "WHAT MORE MIGHT BE DONE WITH THOSE?" THAT
12 DOESN'T -- AND IF WE HAVE IT IDENTIFIED AS A TOXIC AIR
13 CONTAMINANT, WE'LL LOOK AT THE CONTROL PHASE TOGETHER
14 SAYING, "WHAT DO YOU DO CONSIDERING ALL OF THE EFFECTS OF
15 THIS PARTICULAR SOURCE ON AIR QUALITY?"
16 IT'S ALREADY -- THE PROGRAMS THAT WE'VE
17 OUTLINED BEFORE IN TERMS OF THE REDUCTIONS IN P.M. AND
18 N.O.C.'S HAVE ALREADY BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN BOTH THE
19 OZONE AND IN THE PLANNING THAT'S GONE ON FOR THE EXISTING
20 P.M. STANDARD; AND WITH THE CURRENT CONTROLS, WE CAN MAKE
21 THE OZONE STANDARD THE P.M. 10 AND THE STANDARD FOR THE
22 FEDERAL THE P.M. 10 STANDARD.
23 WITH NEW STANDARDS, WE WELL MAY NOT BE ABLE
24 TO WITH CURRENT CONTROLS AND WE'LL HAVE TO SEE WHAT ELSE
25 CAN BE DONE WITH THIS SOURCE, THAT SOURCE CATEGORY THAT'S
0088
01 BEEN MADE A MAJOR SOURCE OF THE PROBLEM.
02 DR. PITTS: WELL, UNDER -- IN YOUR PART B, WHAT I'M
03 LOOKING AT HERE IS HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT FOR DIESEL
04 EXHAUST IN NOVEMBER 1996, AND THAT'S WHAT YOU WERE LOOKING
05 AT, THE DRAFT DOCUMENT. IT WOULD BE -- I THINK IT WOULD
06 BE HELPFUL --
07 DR. ALEXEEFF: THAT'S OUR INTERNAL WORKING DRAFT.
08 DR. PITTS: YEAH. YEAH. IT WOULD BE VERY
09 HELPFUL -- IT WOULD BE -- I THINK IT WOULD BE HELPFUL,
10 BECAUSE THERE'S -- FOR EXAMPLE, THERE'S A DISCUSSION OF
11 NONCANCER HEALTH EFFECTS, WHICH IS -- BUT THAT MAY REFER
12 TO P.M. 10 IN THAT --
13 DR. ALEXEEFF: UH-HUH.
14 DR. PITTS: -- BUT WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE TO GET INTO
15 THIS THE SAME SORT OF THING WE WERE TALKING ABOUT WITH
16 E.P.A., JUST WHAT YOU SAID? THAT THESE ARE THE CURRENT
17 STATUS -- THIS IS THE STATUS OF P.M. 10. WE'RE LOOKING AT
18 THAT IN THE CONTEXT OF THIS RISK ASSESSMENT AS BEING
19 VIEWED IN THE CONTEXT THAT A PROGRAM HAS BEEN UNDER WAY,
20 IS UNDER WAY, AND IN FACT IS DEALING WITH THIS SUBJECT
21 FROM A -- AND AT THE APPROPRIATES TIME, THE APPROPRIATE
22 SCHEDULES ARE BEING BROUGHT TOGETHER; AND IF A READER IS
23 INTERESTED IN THAT, THEY SHOULD SEE THE A.R.B. REPORT,
24 SOMETHING LIKE THAT.
25 SO THEN PUT IT RIGHT UP FRONT, BECAUSE IT IS
0089
01 A RISK ASSESSMENT AND THAT SORT OF CLARIFIES A LOT OF
02 DIFFERENT ISSUES AND AGAIN SHOWS -- IT SEEMS TO ME IT
03 SHOWS, AGAIN, A VERY USEFUL COOPERATION OF THE INVOLVEMENT
04 OF THE A.R.B. AND THE WHOLE CREW. IT SHOWS WE'RE NOT
05 GOING TO BE MISLED BY SIMPLY PICKING THIS UP, BECAUSE

06 THESE RISK ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTS ARE USED GLOBALLY.
07 I CAN TELL YOU THE COUNTRIES THEY ARE USED.
08 THE T.A.C. DOCUMENTS THAT YOU ALL HAVE PRODUCED IN THE TWO
09 GROUPS HAVE INTERNATIONAL, WORLDWIDE DISTRIBUTION AND
10 IMPLICATIONS. SO IT WOULD JUST BE -- JUST NAIL IT THERE.
11 YES? COMMENT?
12 MS. DENTON: DOCTOR, THAT'S WHAT WE WERE PLANNING
13 TO DO, WITHOUT GOING INTO ANY SPECIFICS; BUT BE AWARE OF
14 THE INTERNATIONAL 2.5.
15 DR. PITTS: YOU WERE GOING TO PUT THAT IN HERE?
16 MS. DENTON: YEAH. ACTUALLY, WE WERE THINKING
17 ABOUT PUTTING IT IN BOTH PLACES, THE DATA AND THE
18 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.
19 DR. PITTS: YES. PUT IT IN BOTH PLACES SO IT'S
20 CLEAR, "SEE SO-AND-SO."
21 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, I'M AT A LITTLE BIT OF A
22 DISADVANTAGE, HAVING NOT SEEN THE DOCUMENT, BUT IT'S THICK
23 LIKE THEY ALL ARE. I'M CONCERNED --
24 DR. PITTS: LIKE SOME OF THE PANELS WHO VIEW IT,
25 TOO.
0090
01 DR. GLANTZ: I'M CONCERNED ABOUT KIND OF A
02 REPEATING PATTERN WHICH HAS EMERGED OF TAKING TOO LONG TO
03 GET THINGS DONE. I MEAN, I'M ALL FOR PUBLIC INPUT AND
04 PUBLIC REVIEW AND ALL OF THAT, BUT THERE'S A POINT WHERE
05 IT GOES FROM SOLICITING USEFUL INFORMATION TO DRAGGING THE
06 PROCESS OUT AND DELAYING, AND WE CERTAINLY SAW THAT HAPPEN
07 WITH LEAD; AND I'VE EXPRESSED SOME CONCERNS ABOUT THE
08 SECONDHAND SMOKE REPORT, WHICH HOPEFULLY ARE BEING
09 RESOLVED.
10 BUT LET ME ASK JOHN AND JIM, I MEAN, YOU'VE
11 SEEN THIS DOCUMENT. DO YOU THINK THAT WITH A REASONABLE
12 AMOUNT OF EFFORT THEY COULD SIMPLY RELEASE THE NEXT
13 VERSION OF THIS AS THE S.R.P. PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT AND THEN
14 AFTER THAT PERIOD HAVE IT COME TO US, OR DO YOU THINK THEY
15 REALLY NEED ANOTHER WORKSHOP AND GOD-KNOWS-HOW-LONG
16 PROCESS?
17 DR. PITTS: DO YOU WANT PART A FIRST? I'LL GO TO
18 PART A OR PART B. I COULD PERHAPS COMMENT ON PART A AND
19 JOHN COULD -- IN FACT, IT'S A QUESTION THAT WE JUST ASKED
20 DURING THE BREAK. HOW MUCH HAS -- HAVE YOU SEEN, ROBERT?
21 HOW MUCH SUBSTANTIVE NEW INFORMATION,
22 SUBSTANTIVE INFORMATION, HAS BEEN FORTHCOMING, A, IN THE
23 LITERATURE PER SE; AND, B, DO YOU EXPECT TO BE FORTHCOMING
24 WITH YOUR NEW MODEL SYSTEM WITH THE EMISSIONS FACTORS?
25 HOW MUCH WILL THAT CHANGE WHAT WAS WRITTEN
0091
01 AND CAME OUT AND SUBJECT TO PUBLIC VIEW IN 1994? WHAT
02 SORT OF A -- OH, IS IT A DOUBLING OR HAVE THINGS REALLY
03 CHANGED DRAMATICALLY IN EMISSIONS? WHERE DO WE STAND, SO
04 WE HAVE AN IDEA OF WHAT -- HOW IMPORTANT THIS INTERVAL IS
05 AND WAS DEVELOPED?
06 I CAN SAY AS FAR AS I CAN SEE -- AND I'VE
07 READ THE A REPORT AND I'VE READ THE OTHER REPORTS.
08 ANOTHER REASON -- I'VE GOT MOST OF THESE THINGS AND I
09 HAVEN'T READ ANYTHING THAT I'VE SEEN IN TERMS OF EXPOSURE
10 ESTIMATES THAT ARE DRAMATICALLY DIFFERENT.

11 WHAT I'VE SEEN IS THE EMPHASIS ON P.M. 2.5
12 AND WHAT I'VE SEEN IS CLEAR-CUT ACROSS THE ATMOSPHERIC
13 CHEMISTRY SIDE OR AT THE ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCES SIDE.
14 MS. DENTON: LET ME JUST -- I'LL TURN IT OVER TO
15 ROBERT JUST IN A MOMENT. JUST FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE
16 AUDIENCE, DR. PITTS HAS OUR LATEST INTERNAL DRAFT REPORT,
17 THE PART B. AS YOU LOOK AT PART B --
18 DR. PITTS: THAT'S THIS ONE AND I HAVE GONE THROUGH
19 THIS AND THEY'RE APPROXIMATELY EQUAL WITHIN EXPERIMENTAL
20 ERROR.
21 MS. DENTON: THERE WILL BE, IN ADDITION, A THIRD
22 VERSION OF THE REPORT. THE PLAN IS TO HAVE A THIRD
23 VERSION OF THAT REPORT, WHICH WOULD BE THE PUBLIC
24 VERSION. NOW, BETWEEN THE COPY THAT YOU HAVE, DR. PITTS,
25 AND OUR FIRST VERSION WHICH WAS RELEASED IN '94, THERE IS
0092
01 SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT, IN THAT WE'VE ADDED ACTIVITY
02 DATA, WE'VE ADDED INDOOR AIR DATA, WE'VE ADDED A NEW
03 MODEL, WE'VE ADDED A HOT SPOT EXPOSURE.
04 SO THERE IS -- AND I DON'T THINK THAT THERE
05 WOULD BE -- IT'S RIGHT WITHIN THE RANGE OF OTHER STUDIES
06 THAT HAVE COME OUT; BUT AS FAR AS OUR OWN EXPOSURE
07 ASSESSMENT, IT IS A STEP AHEAD OF THE 1994 VERSION.
08 IN ADDITION TO THIS VERSION THAT DR. PITTS IS
09 LOOKING AT, WE WERE PLANNING NOW, SINCE OUR NEW EMISSION
10 INVENTORY HAS COME OUT, TO NOW IMPROVE IT EVEN THAT MUCH
11 FURTHER FOR THE NEXT COMMENT PERIOD, TO INCLUDE THE NEW
12 EMISSIONS INVENTORY.
13 AND I'LL TURN IT OVER TO ROBERT TO DISCUSS
14 HOW MUCH THAT WOULD CHANGE FROM THE VERSION DR. PITTS HAS.
15 MR. KRIEGER: ACTUALLY, THE VERSIONS YOU HAVE
16 THERE, THE NUMBERS WOULD ONLY CHANGE 10 TO 15 PERCENT, BUT
17 IT WOULD DECREASE.
18 AND, AGAIN, JUST TO STAY WITH WHAT JOAN HAS
19 SAID, WE'VE ADDED AN INDOOR EXPENSE AND A TOTAL EXPOSURE
20 ANALYSIS, AS WELL INCLUDING HOT SPOTS. SO WE'VE ADDED
21 QUITE A BIT. BUT AS FAR AS AN INVENTORY, THE NUMBERS
22 AREN'T GOING TO INCUR THAT DRAMATICALLY.
23 DR. PITTS: I CONCUR. THINGS DON'T CHANGE THAT
24 DRAMATICALLY AND METHYL DOES REACT TO THE ATMOSPHERE. YOU
25 DO FORM INTERESTING SPECIES THERE. THAT'S ATMOSPHERIC
0093
01 CHEMISTRY. IT MEASURES THE ADVANCE IN ATMOSPHERIC
02 CHEMISTRY AND THEN THE INDOOR WAS CRITICALLY IMPORTANT.
03 I JUST WANTED TO ASK YOU THE QUESTION TO HEAR
04 WHAT I HEARD, WHICH IS THAT THERE HAS BEEN A SIGNIFICANT
05 IMPROVEMENT IN -- NOT JUST AN IMPROVEMENT BUT AN EXPANSION
06 AND UPDATING, A STATE OF THE ART; AND THERE HAVE BEEN
07 CHANGES IN THOSE AREAS IN THE LAST -- NOT SO IN THE
08 ABSOLUTE EMISSIONS, BUT IN TERMS OF AN UNDERSTANDING OF
09 THE INDOOR RELATIVE EXPOSURE. THE E.T.A. WAS THERE.
10 MS. DENTON: AND, DR. GLANTZ, IN RESPONSE THERE TO
11 YOUR QUESTION TO ME, THE IDEA FOR ALL THESE PUBLIC
12 COMMENTS ARE THAT THE DOCUMENT GETS TO YOU IN AS REFINED A
13 FORM AS IT CAN GET. I DON'T THINK THERE'S GOING TO BE TOO
14 MUCH CONTROVERSY OF OVER WHAT'S DONE BECAUSE WE'VE UPDATED
15 IT. I MEAN, WE THINK THAT IT'S -- FROM THE PART A

16 PERSPECTIVE, IT'S PRETTY GOOD.
17 DR. PITTS: IT'S FINE.
18 MS. DENTON: THE INTENT IS JUST TO HAVE IT AS
19 REFINED AS POSSIBLE.
20 DR. GLANTZ: NO. I UNDERSTAND THAT, BUT THERE'S A
21 POINT WHERE YOU CAN POLISH IT TO THE POINT WHERE YOU HAVE
22 A HOLE IN IT. AND I MEAN, THIS SORT OF IS THE DISCUSSION
23 I GET INTO WITH GRADUATE STUDENTS SOMETIMES ABOUT "IT'S
24 FINISHED. OKAY. YOU CAN WORK ON IT FOR TWO MORE YEARS,
25 BUT IT STILL WOULD BE FINISHED."
0094
01 AND I MEAN, I'M CONCERNED THAT THE PROCESS
02 FOR THESE REPORTS IS JUST GETTING -- EVERY ONE IS GETTING
03 MORE AND MORE AND MORE DRAGGED OUT AND IF THERE ARE NO
04 FUNDAMENTAL RADICAL DIFFERENT THINGS OTHER THAN THAT THE
05 REPORT HAS GOTTEN BETTER -- WHICH HOPEFULLY THEY WOULD GET
06 BETTER IN EACH SUBSEQUENT DRAFT. I MEAN, ONE WOULD HOPE
07 THAT WOULD HAPPEN -- I MEAN, I HAVEN'T HEARD ANYTHING SAID
08 WHICH SAYS TO ME THAT WE NEED THAT -- THAT WE COULDN'T
09 SIMPLY HAVE THIS REPORT, THE NEXT DRAFT OF THIS, RELEASED
10 AS THE S.R.P. PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT.
11 THAT STILL GIVES A PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
12 WHERE PEOPLE CAN COME IN AND COMMENT AND YOU CAN RESPOND
13 TO THE COMMENTS BEFORE IT COMES TO THE COMMITTEE, AND IT
14 JUST SEEMS TO ME THAT THIS IS JUST UNNECESSARY DELAY AND
15 DRAGGING THE PROCESS OUT WHEN IT -- I MEAN, I WENT TO THE
16 WORKSHOP WHENEVER IT WAS IN JANUARY. IT WAS VERY
17 INTERESTING, BUT I DIDN'T HEAR ANY RADICAL NEW ISSUES
18 RAISED, YOU KNOW.
19 I MEAN, IT IS FUNNY. I GO TO THE WORKSHOPS
20 ON SECONDHAND SMOKE AND THE TOBACCO COMPANIES GET UP AND
21 SAY, "IT'S ALL DIESEL FUMES" AND IT WAS FUN TO SEE THE
22 DIESEL PEOPLE GETTING UP AND SAYING, "IT'S ALL CIGARETTE
23 SMOKE." IT WAS KIND OF ENTERTAINING, BUT I HAVEN'T SEEN
24 ANYTHING RADICALLY NEW THAT WOULD DRASTICALLY CHANGE THE
25 REPORT; AND I THINK THERE'S A POINT, GETTING ON WITH WHAT
0095
01 JOHN SAID, WHEREIN IN THE INTEREST OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH
02 YOU JUST HAVE TO MOVE THE PROCESS FORWARD.
03 I MEAN, IF WE -- IF SOME RADICAL NEW BIT OF
04 INFORMATION COMES TO LIGHT LATER, WE HAVE A PROCEDURE FOR
05 REVISITING THESE THINGS AND WE HAVE REVISITED A COUPLE OF
06 COMPOUNDS.
07 SO UNLESS JOHN HAVING READ THE PART B
08 DISAGREES, I DON'T KNOW WHAT WE CAN DO TO GET THE NEXT
09 DRAFT TO BE THE S.R.P. PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT, BUT I HOPE
10 THAT YOU CAN JUST DO IT AND WE CAN MOVE ON. I MEAN, DO
11 YOU DISAGREE WITH THAT?
12 DR. FROINES: NO, I DON'T DISAGREE. I FEEL -- I
13 MEAN, THE FIRST THING THAT HAS TO BE SAID IS THAT THIS IS
14 AN EXTREMELY IMPORTANT COMPOUND. THE STAKES ARE VERY
15 HIGH. THE INDUSTRY IS GOING TO BE AFFECTED BY IT. THE
16 PUBLIC'S AFFECTED BY IT, SO IT'S OBVIOUSLY SOMETHING WE
17 WANT TO DO. WE CARE.
18 HAVING SAID THAT, I THINK THE QUESTION COMES,
19 "IS THERE NEW INFORMATION THAT'S BECOMING AVAILABLE THAT
20 WOULD MARKEDLY AFFECT THIS DOCUMENT? AND MY SENSE -- AND

21 GEORGE AND HIS STAFF MAY KNOW OF OTHER STUDIES THAT ARE
22 BEING DONE; BUT AS FAR AS I KNOW, UNLESS THEY ARE -- IF
23 THEY ARE, THEY'RE BEING DONE IN EUROPE. THEY'RE NOT BEING
24 DONE IN THE UNITED STATES.
25 FOR EXAMPLE, THERE'S SOME DATA OUT
0096
01 QUESTIONING WHETHER THE N.C.I./N.I.O.S.H. STUDY'S GOING TO
02 GO FORWARD AND WHETHER PEOPLE SHOULD WAIT FOR THAT
03 N.C.I./N.I.O.S.H. STUDY. BUT THAT STUDY'S NOT EVEN OFF
04 THE GROUND YET AND THAT STUDY COULD TAKE YEARS.
05 NOW, I DON'T KNOW OF ANY OTHER MAJOR STUDIES
06 THAT ARE CURRENTLY BEING DEVELOPED OR ONGOING THAT WOULD
07 COME TO THE WORKSHOP AND SAY, "OH, BY THE WAY. WE'VE DONE
08 A STUDY AND IT ELIMINATES EVERYTHING THAT'S IN THIS
09 DOCUMENT."
10 THIS DOCUMENT'S GETTING HEAVIER AND HEAVIER
11 AND AT SOME POINT YOU HAVE TO SAY, "WELL, WE DO HAVE TO
12 MAKE DECISIONS IN THE FACE OF UNCERTAINTY," AS WE ALL
13 KNOW.
14 I THINK THAT THE QUESTION OF THE WORKSHOP IS
15 ONE THAT SHOULD BE DEPENDENT ON WHETHER THERE IS MAJOR NEW
16 EVIDENCE THAT OCCURRED, BECAUSE IF YOU'RE JUST TALKING
17 ABOUT SOMEBODY'S LITTLE STUDY COMING IN, IT'S NOT GOING TO
18 AFFECT THE WEIGHT OF THIS WHOLE EVIDENCE. IT MAY AFFECT
19 PIECES OF IT AND WE DON'T WANT TO CREATE SMALL -- WE DON'T
20 WANT TO -- WE HAVE TO DEAL WITH THE FOREST AND NOT TREES;
21 AND SOMEHOW IF WE HAVE A FEW TREES COMING IN AND IT'S NOT
22 NECESSARILY GOING TO AFFECT THE WEIGHT OF THE WHOLE STUDY,
23 MY SENSE IS THAT WHAT WE HAVE IN THIS DOCUMENT IS WHAT
24 WE'RE GOING TO HAVE.
25 THEREFORE, AT A WORKSHOP, WE MAY BE TREATED
0097
01 TO STAN DAWSON AND KENNY CRUMP ARGUING VOCIFEROUSLY ABOUT
02 THEIR DIFFERENT POINTS OF VIEW; BUT AT SOME POINT -- I'VE
03 FRANKLY GOTTEN TIRED OF THE CRUMP-DAWSON DEBATE BECAUSE
04 IT'S GOTTEN DOWN TO THIS LEVEL. THIS IS AN ISSUE WHERE
05 ONE HAS TO SAY, IS THERE A BIOLOGICAL BASIS FOR THE
06 CARCINOGENICITY OF DIESEL EXHAUST? AND I THINK THAT THERE
07 CLEARLY IS.
08 I THINK THAT THE EVIDENCE INDICATES THAT, AND
09 SO IT'S NOT SIMPLY GOING TO BE DETERMINED BY THE
10 CRUMP-DAWSON ARGUMENT IN THE LONG RUN. THERE'S MUCH MORE
11 SCIENCE HERE. AND SO I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE PURPOSE OF THE
12 WORKSHOP IS, ACTUALLY.
13 DR. FRIEDMAN: WHAT I'M GOING TO SAY NOW IS NOT
14 MEANT AT ALL TO CONTRADICT WHAT JOHN AND STAN SAID, BUT
15 FOR MY OWN INFORMATION. I'D LIKE TO UNDERSTAND WHAT THE
16 TIMING OF THE DOCUMENT HAS TO DO WITH PUBLIC HEALTH.
17 SOMEONE SAID IN 1990 REGULATIONS WENT THROUGH
18 THAT DRASTICALLY CUT THE EMISSIONS. APPARENTLY, THAT WAS
19 NOT BASED ON THIS REPORT. WHAT IS DEPENDENT ON THIS
20 REPORT THAT CAN'T BE DONE WITHOUT THIS REPORT?
21 DR. FROINES: WELL, THAT'S THE QUESTION ABOUT --
22 THAT'S WHY I ASKED THE QUESTION ABOUT THE NEW E.P.A. RULES
23 THAT ARE GOING TO HAVE AN IMPACT ON DIESEL LEVELS OF
24 DIESEL PARTICULATES. THEY WILL IMPACT IT; BUT PRESUMABLY
25 ONCE THIS IS THROUGH, THEN THEY'LL BE GETTING THE RISK

0098
01 MANAGEMENT PHASE HERE AND THAT WILL IMPACT IT AT SOME
02 POINT.
03 DR. FRIEDMAN: BUT HASN'T RISK MANAGEMENT BEEN
04 GOING ON ALREADY IN 1990? WAS THAT NOT BASED ON
05 CALIFORNIA?
06 MS. DENTON: RISK MANAGEMENT HAS BEEN GOING ON
07 REGARDING P.M. AND N.O.C.'S FROM A CRITERION POLLUTANT
08 ANGLE. NOW WE'RE LOOKING AT DIESEL EXHAUST FROM A
09 CARCINOGENIC ANGLE, WHICH MEANS WITH THE IDENTIFICATION OF
10 DIESEL EXHAUST THEN BECOMES A WHOLE EVALUATION OF DIESEL
11 EXHAUST, SPECIFICALLY IN CALIFORNIA, AND THE RISK AND
12 SOURCES, YOU KNOW, AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT.
13 DR. FRIEDMAN: SO THE PREVIOUS REGULATIONS WERE NOT
14 BASED ON SOME CONCERN ABOUT DIESEL EXHAUST PER SE?
15 MS. DENTON: THEY WERE BASED ON THE CRITERION
16 POLLUTANT AND IT DOES HAPPEN TO HIT DIESEL EXHAUST BECAUSE
17 DIESEL EXHAUST WAS A TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT FOR MOBILE
18 SOURCES.
19 DR. GLANTZ: BUT WOULD IT BE CORRECT TO SAY -- THIS
20 ISN'T THE FIRST COMPOUND BEFORE US WHERE ACTIONS BASED ON
21 CRITERION POLLUTANT REGULATIONS HAD AN IMPACT ON EMISSIONS
22 AND THE THING BEFORE US AND THIS THING ABOUT SAYING, WELL,
23 BACK IN THE BAD OLD DAYS, THERE WAS THIS MUCH, BUT NOW
24 BECAUSE OF CERTAIN ACTIONS OF THE E.P.A. THERE'S LESS.
25 THAT'S HAPPENED IN SEVERAL OF THESE REPORTS,
0099
01 BUT THAT -- WHAT THIS IS SAYING IS THAT THERE ARE OTHER
02 END POINTS THAT THE OTHER REGULATIONS HAVEN'T CONSIDERED.
03 THAT'S A FAIR --
04 MS. DENTON: LEAD WAS A GOOD EXAMPLE, TAKING LEAD
05 OUT OF GASOLINE AND CONSIDERING IT AS A TOXIC AIR
06 CONTAMINANT. IT WAS A DIFFERENT PROGRAM.
07 DR. PITTS: JIM?
08 DR. SEIBER: WELL, I THINK OUR JOB IS TO CONSIDER
09 WHETHER THIS SHOULD BE CLASSIFIED AS A TOXIC AIR
10 CONTAMINANT OR NOT. WE STARTED THAT PROCESS BACK IN
11 1989. IT SEEMS LIKE AT ONE POINT WE SHOULD SAY, "YES, IT
12 IS" OR "NO, IT ISN'T," AND YEAH, I'VE GONE TO THE WORKSHOP
13 AND TRIED TO FOLLOW THE ARGUMENTS AND I DON'T THINK THINGS
14 ARE GOING TO CHANGE VERY MUCH.
15 I THINK THERE'S ALSO A DANGER THAT IF
16 CALIFORNIA DOESN'T MOVE AHEAD -- YOU KNOW, DIESEL'S A
17 WORLDWIDE PROBLEM, DIESEL EXHAUST. OTHER COUNTRIES ARE
18 ATTACKING THIS VIGOROUSLY AND WE MAY FIND OUT WE'LL HAVE
19 TO RADICALLY CHANGE HOW DIESEL ENGINES ARE OPERATED OR
20 TYPES OF FUEL THEY USE; BUT WE MIGHT BE BEHIND THE OTHER
21 PARTS OF THE WORLD.
22 SO THE ARGUMENT ABOUT THE INDUSTRY SUFFERING,
23 YEAH, THEY MIGHT SUFFER A SHORT-TERM DECREASE; BUT IN THE
24 LONG RUN, THEY MAY SUFFER AN EVEN LARGER BLOW IF THEY
25 DON'T GET OUT THE LEADING EDGE AND ACCEPT THE INEVITABLE
0100
01 AND START MAKING THE CHANGES THAT CALIFORNIA IS GOING TO
02 REQUIRE AND WILL BE HAPPENING IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD.
03 SO THIS ARGUMENT ABOUT THE INDUSTRY MIGHT
04 SUFFER OR THEY MIGHT NOT, YOU KNOW, YOU'VE GOT TO LOOK AT

05 THE WHOLE LONG ROAD THAT'S AHEAD OF US.
06 DR. GLANTZ: ALTHOUGH THAT'S NOT SOMETHING WE'RE --
07 I MEAN, WE'RE LOOKING AT THE SCIENCE. INDUSTRY SUFFERING
08 IS THE REGULATOR'S PROBLEM. I HAVEN'T HEARD ANYTHING AT
09 ALL SAID THAT IS A COMPELLING ARGUMENT TO NOT BRING THE
10 NEXT DRAFT OF THIS REPORT FORWARD AS THE S.R.P. PUBLIC
11 REVIEW DRAFT.
12 I MEAN, I DON'T KNOW WHAT WE CAN DO TO MAKE
13 THAT HAPPEN, BUT IT JUST SEEMS THAT -- I MEAN, I HAVEN'T
14 HEARD ONE REASON THAT THAT WOULDN'T BE SENSIBLE, AND IF WE
15 WENT BACK TO THE WAY THIS PROCESS WORKED FOUR YEARS AGO,
16 IT WOULD HAVE BEEN. WE DIDN'T USED TO HAVE THESE
17 INTERMINABLE DRAFTS AND WORKSHOPS ON WORKSHOPS ON
18 WORKSHOPS. THERE WAS A WORKSHOP.
19 DR. FROINES: THERE ARE -- LET ME KIND OF JUST
20 COMMENT ON THIS. I THINK THAT THE ONE THING THAT IS
21 IMPORTANT TO KEEP IN MIND IS THAT THERE'S SOME VERY
22 COMPLEX TECHNICAL ISSUES WITH THIS COMPOUND, WITH THESE
23 COMPOUNDS, AND THAT THEY'RE NOT TRIVIAL AND THAT WE -- BUT
24 I HAVEN'T SEEN THEM. I HAVEN'T SEEN BRIGHT LIGHTS
25 REVOLVING ON SOME OF THOSE ISSUES.
0101
01 I SHOULD SAY JUST FOR EVERYBODY'S BEHALF -- I
02 DON'T WANT TO QUOTE OR CITE THIS BECAUSE IT HAS THIS BIG
03 THING THAT SAYS "DON'T CITE OR QUOTE FROM THIS" -- BUT I
04 WANT TO SAY THAT I THINK THIS IS A VERY WELL-DONE DOCUMENT
05 FROM MY VERY LIMITED REVIEW.
06 DR. GLANTZ: IT SEEMS TO ME IF THE NEXT DRAFT WERE
07 TO MOVE FORWARD AS THE S.R.P. PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT, ALL THE
08 PEOPLE WHO ARE CONCERNED ABOUT THIS WILL HAVE AN
09 OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT AND YOU GUYS WILL HAVE AN
10 OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND TO THOSE COMMENTS, AND WHEN IT
11 COMES BACK TO -- OR IF THAT WERE TO HAPPEN AND IF IT CAME
12 BACK TO US AND THERE WERE THINGS THAT WERE VIEWED AS
13 SERIOUS OUTSTANDING ISSUES, THEN WE COULD SOLICIT MORE
14 INPUT; BUT I'M JUST VERY CONCERNED ABOUT A PATTERN THAT I
15 SEE ABOUT JUST DRAGGING EVERYTHING OUT AND TURNING THE
16 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIODS AND THE WORKSHOPS, WHICH STARTED
17 OUT AS AN INFORMAL DEVICE TO GET PUBLIC INVOLVED AND TO
18 GET INFORMATION AND TO CREATE HIGH-QUALITY DOCUMENTS --
19 IT'S TURNED INTO THIS SORT OF INTERMINABLE PROCESS OF
20 DELAY.
21 I MEAN, YOU'RE NEVER -- I MEAN, THERE'S A
22 POINT. YOU'RE NEVER GOING TO GET EVERYBODY TO AGREE ON
23 WHAT ONE OF THESE DOCUMENTS SAYS, AND YOU'RE NEVER GOING
24 TO GET TWO DOCUMENTS WHERE THERE'S NO CHANGE FROM ONE TO
25 THE NEXT. I MEAN, IT'S THE NATURE OF REVISING THINGS. SO
0102
01 I MEAN, IT'S JUST VERY FRUSTRATING TO SEE THIS THING DRAG.
02 I MEAN, IS THERE ANYTHING, JIM, TO MAKE --
03 THAT WE CAN SAY OR DO TO STRONGLY URGE THEM?
04 MS. DENTON: I WAS JUST GOING TO MAKE A
05 SUGGESTION, DR. GLANTZ. OF COURSE OUR CONCERN IS THAT THE
06 PUBLIC PROCESS HAS BEEN FULFILLED. WHAT I MIGHT SUGGEST,
07 YOU KNOW, IS THAT AS THE PANEL'S DONE IN THE PAST, THEY
08 COULD WRITE A LETTER, YOU KNOW, STATING WHAT YOU'VE STATED
09 AND, YOU KNOW, TO OUR CHAIR WITH THAT REQUEST. THAT'S AN

10 OPTION. IT'S JUST --
11 DR. GLANTZ: I MEAN, WHAT DO OTHER PEOPLE THINK? I
12 MEAN, I THINK THAT'S A GOOD IDEA. WHAT DO OTHER PEOPLE
13 THINK?
14 DR. SEIBER: THAT WOULD MOVE IT ALONG. I'M
15 CERTAINLY IN FAVOR.
16 DR. PITTS: TO WRITE A LETTER --
17 DR. SEIBER: IF THAT'S WHAT WE CAN DO.
18 DR. PITTS: -- EXPRESSING OUR CONCERN? THAT'S ONE
19 POSSIBILITY. CERTAINLY THE CONTEXT OF THAT. I'M HOLDING
20 HERE ONE OF THESE I.A.R.C. -- THAT'S I-A-R-C AND IT STANDS
21 FOR INTERNATIONAL AGENCY FOR RESEARCH ON CANCER --
22 DOCUMENTS WHICH IS AN UNENDED -- THE MEMBERS WHO EVALUATE
23 THESE VARIOUS CARCINOGENS ARE MEMBERS OF THE INDUSTRY,
24 DRAWN FROM ACADEMIA, DRAWN FROM GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, AND
25 THIS IS 1989 AND THEY GO IN GREAT DETAIL ABOUT HOW THEY
0103
01 ESTABLISHED THE RANKINGS FOR VARIOUS CARCINOGENS AND THE
02 RATINGS FOR HUMAN CARCINOGENICITY AND SO FORTH AND SO ON
03 AND THEY HAVE OVERALL EVALUATIONS.
04 I READ HERE, AND THIS IS BY DENNIS SHUE
05 (PHONETIC) WHO WAS A MEMBER OF THIS PANEL. THIS IS
06 TULANE. IT SAYS HERE THAT, "AFTER THE OVERALL
07 EVALUATION FOR DIESEL ENGINE EXHAUST,
08 LIMITED DATA FOR HUMANS, SUFFICIENT
09 FOR ANIMALS, AND IT'S 2-A, WHICH IS
10 PROBABLE HUMAN CARCINOGEN."
11 I MEAN, WHAT'S CHANGED SINCE 1989? AND I'M
12 NOT BEING FACETIOUS AT ALL. I'M SAYING IF WE START THERE,
13 HAS THERE BEEN EVIDENCE TO SUGGEST, FOR EXAMPLE, FROM THIS
14 UNBIASED BODY, PRESUMABLY, THAT HAS CHANGED THE
15 PERSPECTIVE OF THE COMMUNITY OF HEALTH SCIENTISTS THAT
16 SAY, IN FACT, THESE ARE QUESTIONABLE?
17 NOW, IF THERE HASN'T, IT SORT OF GOES ALONG.
18 THAT'S EIGHT YEARS. I UNDERSTAND THE ONE -- AND THIS IS A
19 QUESTION WHICH YOU NEED TO ADDRESS. THE ONE AREA THAT
20 I'VE SEEN IN HERE AND IT'S FROM A SIMPLE CHEMIST, THE
21 LOVELY STUDIES WHERE THEY EXPOSE RATS TO SODRADIOXIDE
22 (PHONETIC) AND TANGRIDIOXIDE (PHONETIC) AND FOUND LUNG
23 CANCER IN HEAVY LEVELS, BUT THERE'S ALSO BEEN REBUTTAL TO
24 THAT THAT SAYS THAT DOESN'T MEAN THAT NECESSARILY APPLIES
25 TO DIESEL FUEL AND YOU MAY BE MIXING APPLES AND ORANGES
0104
01 AND THAT'S SPECIFICALLY ONLY FOR LUNG CANCER, AS I
02 UNDERSTAND IT.
03 OTHER THAN THAT STUDY THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED
04 IN YOUR PAPER, HAS ANYTHING ELSE COME OUT THAT YOU'VE SEEN
05 SINCE THEN THAT REALLY DRAMATICALLY CHANGED THE
06 CONCLUSIONS THAT IS PROBABLE FOR HUMAN --
07 DR. ALEXEEFF: WELL, FIRST OF ALL, I HAVEN'T HAD A
08 CHANCE TO SHOW YOU MY SLIDES, BUT I'D BE HAPPY TO ANSWER
09 YOUR QUESTION.
10 DR. PITTS: GO AHEAD.
11 DR. ALEXEEFF: THERE HAS ACTUALLY BEEN A LOT OF
12 INFORMATION THAT HAS OCCURRED SINCE 1989 AND OF COURSE OUR
13 REPORT CAME OUT IN 1994 SO WE'VE CAPTURED A CERTAIN AMOUNT
14 OF THAT CHANGE ALREADY; BUT EVEN SUBSEQUENT TO OUR REPORT

15 IN JUNE OF '94, THERE WAS A U.S. E.P.A. REPORT THAT WAS
16 RELEASED AND THE H.E.I. REPORT THAT WAS RELEASED.
17 AND ALTHOUGH IN TERMS OF US AND PRIMARILY
18 U.S. E.P.A., I THINK ON A STAFF-TO-STAFF DISCUSSION WE
19 FEEL THAT OUR REPORTS ARE CONSISTENT AND WE SEE EACH
20 OTHER'S POINTS, AT THE SAME TIME, SIMPLY BECAUSE THE WAY
21 THE REPORTS ARE WRITTEN, THE WAY EMPHASIS WAS PLACED IN
22 DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE TWO REPORTS, U.S. E.P.A. AND
23 CAL/E.P.A.'S REPORTS, THERE HAS BEEN A SENSE THAT THE
24 REPORTS ARE DISPARATE OR INCONSISTENT.
25 SO THAT WAS THE REASON THAT WE HELD IN PART
0105
01 THIS CONFERENCE IN JANUARY TO TRY TO BRING A -- WORK
02 TOWARDS A CONSENSUS WITH US AND U.S. E.P.A. AND AS
03 POINTED OUT IN THE SLIDE I'LL -- O.E.H.H.A., N.I.O.S.H.
04 AND W.H.O. AND H.E.I. WERE ALL INVOLVED AS WELL.
05 SO THERE'S BEEN A BUNCH OF -- THERE HAS BEEN
06 A FAIRLY LARGE AMOUNT OF INFORMATION THAT HAS OCCURRED
07 OVER THE YEARS, AND I THINK THE IMPORTANT THING IS TO
08 REMEMBER ONCE OUR REPORT IS READY FOR PUBLIC RELEASE AND
09 DOES GET PUBLIC INPUT, THEN THEY'LL BE ABLE TO SEE HOW WE
10 TIED IT ALL TOGETHER.
11 WE HAVE ALSO BEEN KEEPING IN CLOSE CONTACT
12 WITH U.S. E.P.A. AND THEY ARE ALSO CLOSE TO RELEASING
13 THEIR REVISED DOCUMENT AS WELL; AND I THINK THAT WHEN THE
14 DOCUMENTS ARE RELEASED, THEY'LL SEE THE TWO DOCUMENTS ARE
15 MUCH CLOSELY TIED.
16 I'M NOT SAYING THAT THERE'S -- THE
17 CONCLUSIONS AND THAT SORT OF THING ARE GOING TO BE MUCH
18 CLOSER THAN THEY WERE IN THE TWO PREVIOUS VERSIONS THAT
19 BOTH CAME OUT IN 1994. SO AT THE SAME TIME, THOUGH,
20 BECAUSE -- ALTHOUGH THE FINAL CONCLUSIONS, MAYBE THE
21 BOTTOM-LINE CONCLUSION OF IT SHOULD BE A TOXIC
22 CONTAMINANT, THAT TYPE OF THING WILL NOT HAVE CHANGED.
23 THERE ISN'T A LARGE AMOUNT OF NEGATIVE
24 STUDIES THAT WOULD TOTALLY OVERTURN EVERYTHING FOR EITHER
25 US OR U.S. E.P.A. AND THE RANGE OF RISK, WHICH IS AN ISSUE
0106
01 FOR US, IS PRETTY MUCH THE SAME; BUT THE WAY THAT ONE
02 UNDERSTANDS THE RISK AND THAT SORT OF THING, THOSE THINGS
03 ARE DIFFERENT.
04 DR. PITTS: GARY?
05 DR. FRIEDMAN: I JUST WANTED TO ASK, YOU KNOW, I
06 SUPPORT WHAT'S BEEN SAID ABOUT SPEEDING UP THE PROCESS AND
07 TRYING TO GET OUT -- I FORGOT WHAT YOU CALLED IT -- AN
08 S.R.P. DOCUMENT OR PRE-S.R.P. PROJECT.
09 YOU'VE ALREADY HAD ONE WORKSHOP. WHAT DO YOU
10 THINK THE SUMMARY 1997 WORKSHOP WOULD ADD OF IMPORTANCE
11 THAT WOULD CHANGE ANYTHING? YOU'RE GOING TO GET PUBLIC
12 COMMENT ANYWAY.
13 MS. DENTON: THIS IS SIMILAR TO THE WORKSHOP THAT
14 WE HELD FOR OUR FIRST DRAFT REPORT AND IT'S SIMPLY
15 DESIGNED TO PROVIDE THE PUBLIC AN OPPORTUNITY TO MEET WITH
16 THE STAFF. THEY'VE HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO LOOK AT THE
17 REPORT AND THEY COME IN AND THE STAFF AND THE PUBLIC
18 DISCUSS ISSUES, AND GENERALLY ONE OR TWO S.R.P. MEMBERS IS
19 PRESENT SO THAT YOU ALSO ARE AWARE OF THE ISSUES.

20 SO IT'S A WAY OF, AGAIN, COMING TO KIND OF
21 A -- IT'S A VERBAL WAY OF EXPRESSING WHAT PEOPLE ARE
22 SEEING AS THE ISSUES WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE
23 INTERACTION WITH STAFF. AND THEN AFTER THAT THERE, WE
24 HAVE THE DEADLINE FOR THE WRITTEN COMMENTS AND SO PEOPLE
25 CAN KIND OF FOCUS THEIR COMMENTS MORE EASILY. INSTEAD OF
0107
01 JUST A WRITTEN COMMENT, THEY ALSO HAVE A CHANCE AT THIS
02 WORKSHOP.
03 DR. FRIEDMAN: DO YOU FEEL THAT ADDITIONAL ORAL
04 INFORMATION REALLY ADDS ANYTHING OF SIGNIFICANCE THAT YOU
05 DON'T GET WITH THE WRITTEN OPINION?
06 MS. DENTON: GEORGE MAY HAVE A DIFFERENT OPINION.
07 I DO THINK IT HELPS CLARIFY FOR OURSELVES WHAT WE CAN
08 ANTICIPATE AS COMMENTS COMING FROM THE PUBLIC. IT ALSO
09 GIVES THEM, I'M SURE, THE OPPORTUNITY TO KIND OF MAYBE
10 FIND OUT WHERE, YOU KNOW, INFORMATION THAT WE'VE USED OR
11 WHATEVER. I KNOW IT'S HELPED CLARIFY FOR US WHAT WE CAN
12 ANTICIPATE AS THE WRITTEN COMMENTS THAT WE'RE GOING TO
13 RECEIVE.
14 DR. GLANTZ: BUT IT DOESN'T REALLY -- IT'S NOT
15 REALLY GOING TO AT THIS POINT IN THE PROCESS CHANGE THINGS
16 RADICALLY. I MEAN, THE PURPOSE OF THESE WORKSHOPS, AS I
17 SEE THEM IN THE ONES I'VE GONE TO, IS TO GATHER
18 INFORMATION.
19 AND IN ANSWER TO THE VARIOUS QUESTIONS
20 VARIOUS OF US HAS ASKED, NO ONE HAS SAID, "HERE'S SOME
21 RADICAL NEW INSIGHT THAT WE'RE EXPECTING" OR "THERE'S BEEN
22 A DRAMATIC CHANGE IN THE DIRECTION OF THE DOCUMENT" OR
23 ANYTHING LIKE THAT. I MEAN, THIS IS JUST MORE INFORMATION
24 GATHERING AND AT SOME POINT YOU'VE GOT TO SAY, "WE'VE
25 GATHERED INFORMATION AND WE NEED TO MOVE FORWARD."
0108
01 I MEAN, I HAVEN'T HEARD ANYTHING SAID FROM
02 ANY OF YOU GUYS THAT SAYS THERE WOULD BE SUBSTANTIAL
03 BENEFIT TO THE DOCUMENT, YOU KNOW, TO THE FINAL PRODUCT
04 FROM A SCIENTIFIC POINT OF VIEW THAT WOULD BE GAINED BY
05 HAVING ANOTHER WORKSHOP VERSUS JUST PUTTING IT OUT THERE
06 AND LETTING PEOPLE SUBMIT THEIR COMMENTS.
07 DR. FROINES: WELL, I THINK THERE'S ANOTHER ISSUE
08 WHICH IS -- I WAS INVOLVED IN THE ORGANIZATION OF THE
09 WORKSHOP LAST JANUARY, AND ONE OF THE THINGS WE TRIED TO
10 DO IS TO GET SOME PEOPLE THERE LIKE TOM SMITH AND CATHY
11 HAMMOND WHO UNDERSTOOD -- UNDERSTOOD THE PROBLEMS IN
12 OCCUPATIONAL EPIDEMIOLOGY, WHICH IS DIFFERENT THAN
13 ENVIRONMENT EPIDEMIOLOGY.
14 THERE ARE A SET OF PROBLEMS THAT YOU HAVE
15 WHEN YOU'RE AT WORK IN A WORKPLACE THAT ARE DIFFERENT FROM
16 WHEN YOU DO OTHER KINDS OF STUDIES, AND IT WAS REALLY
17 IMPORTANT TO HAVE PEOPLE THERE WHO WEREN'T SORT OF THE
18 PART OF THE TRADITIONAL E.P.A. RISK-ASSESSMENT TYPE.
19 IT WAS IMPORTANT TO HAVE PEOPLE THERE WHO
20 DEALT WITH ON A DAILY BASIS, WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO
21 EXPERIENCE TOXIC EXPOSURE ON A DAILY BASIS? IN AN
22 OCCUPATIONAL EPI STUDY, THAT WAS REALLY IMPORTANT BECAUSE
23 THERE AREN'T A LOT OF PEOPLE WHO UNDERSTAND THOSE KINDS OF
24 PROBLEMS BECAUSE THEY DON'T SIMPLY WORK WITH IT ON A

25 DAY-TO-DAY BASIS.
0109
01 SO THAT WORKSHOP ACTUALLY BROUGHT IN PEOPLE
02 WHO KNEW SOMETHING ABOUT THE ISSUES WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF
03 THE STUDIES THAT WERE BEING DISCUSSED. THAT'S VERY, VERY
04 IMPORTANT, BECAUSE IT ESTABLISHES AN INTERCHANGE WHICH
05 DOESN'T ALWAYS HAPPEN.
06 NOW, LET'S GO BACK TO THE FIRST WORKSHOP.
07 THE FIRST WORKSHOP I THOUGHT WAS VERY, VERY POOR BECAUSE
08 WHAT IT TURNED OUT TO BE WAS NOT A DISCUSSION AT ALL.
09 WHAT IT GOT OUT WAS THE PEOPLE WHO WANTED TO COME OUT AND
10 TALK ABOUT TOXIC OVERLOAD THEORY, THE PROBLEMS WITH JOE
11 MATERDE'S (PHONETIC) DATA AND ALL THE THINGS WE ARE ALL
12 AWARE OF. PEOPLE CAME AND GAVE PAPERS AND THEN THE
13 MEETING WAS ESSENTIALLY OVER.
14 AND SO I THINK IF YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE A
15 WORKSHOP, IT SHOULD BE PLANNED WHERE IT DOESN'T BECOME
16 JUST A GROUP OF PEOPLE COMING WITH THEIR GROUPS OF PAPERS
17 TO ARGUE THEIR PARTICULAR NARROW CASE, "THIS IS WHY THE
18 SUBSTANCE SHOULD HAVE A THRESHOLD FOR CARCINOGENICITY
19 BASED ON THIS, THIS, THIS AND THIS" WHEN THERE'S ALL THIS
20 OTHER STUFF THAT DOESN'T GET TALKED ABOUT.
21 THE ISSUE IS HOW DO YOU PLAN A WORKSHOP WHERE
22 SOMEBODY SAYS, "BUT THERE IS EVIDENCE OF BIOAVAILABILITY
23 OF COMPOUNDS." LOOK AT ALL THE PAPERS YOU RECEIVE
24 POSTULATING THIS IN. THESE COMPOUNDS ARE BIOAVAILABLE.
25 THEY DO INTERACT WITH E.P.A. AND THE ENVIRONMENT. SO IT'S
0110
01 NOT JUST A QUESTION OF TOXIC OVERLOAD AND CLEARANCE AND
02 ALL OF THAT.
03 IT SEEMS TO ME ONE HAS TO ASK THE QUESTION
04 HOW -- SHOULD THERE BE A WORKSHOP, ONE, AND PERHAPS NOT;
05 BUT IF THERE IS, IT SHOULDN'T BE JUST A FORUM FOR YOUR
06 ANTAGONISTS TO COME AND GIVE LOTS OF PAPERS THAT IN A
07 SENSE NARROW AND DEFINE THE ISSUE IN THOSE TERMS.
08 YOU SHOULD TAKE THE LEAD TO DEFINE THE
09 SCIENTIFIC ISSUES, RATHER THAN SIMPLY THE ISSUES AS
10 DEFINED BY A PARTICULAR ADVOCATE, DEPENDING ON WHOEVER'S
11 SIDE YOU'RE ON.
12 I THINK THE MISTAKE BEING MADE IF WE DON'T DO
13 THAT IS -- THE METHYLENE CHLORIDE WORKSHOP WE HAD WHERE WE
14 HAD DALE OR MYSELF AND A NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO LOOKED AT IT
15 FROM ONE SIDE AND, YOU KNOW, DEL -- WHAT'S HIS NAME -- WHO
16 WAS A DIFFERENT REVIEW AND THAT WAS A VERY DIFFERENT
17 WORKSHOP. IT WAS VERY USEFUL WORKSHOP, I THOUGHT.
18 SO THE WORKSHOP WE HAVE SHOULD BE STRUCTURED
19 SO IT'S NOT JUST SITTING THERE FOR EIGHT HOURS LISTENING
20 TO PEOPLE WHO NARROWLY SELF-DEFINE THEIR POINT OF VIEW
21 BECAUSE IT REFLECTS THE POSITION THEY'RE TRYING TO MAKE.
22 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, SEE, I'VE BEEN TO A NUMBER OF
23 THESE WORKSHOPS. SOME OF THEM HAVE BEEN VERY GOOD. I
24 THOUGHT THE LEAD ONE LAST JANUARY WAS VERY GOOD.
25 I WASN'T AT THE FIRST ONE, BUT THE QUESTION
0111
01 IS YOU HAVE TO SAY, "WHAT ARE THESE THINGS FOR," AND WE'RE
02 NOW AT A VERY ADVANCED STAGE IN THIS PROCESS. YOU'VE GOT
03 A DOCUMENT THAT TWO FAIRLY CRITICAL PEOPLE SAY IS IN GOOD

04 SHAPE AND I DON'T SEE WHAT YOU'RE GOING TO GAIN BY GOING
05 OUT AND DOING IT AGAIN, OTHER THAN DRAGGING THE PROCESS
06 OUT FOR ANOTHER SIX OR EIGHT MONTHS.
07 AND SO, I MEAN, I HAVEN'T HEARD ANYTHING SAID
08 WHERE THERE'S -- ESPECIALLY SINCE THE LAST ONE WAS SO
09 GOOD. AND I MEAN, THE OTHER THING I WAS GOING TO SAY IS
10 I'VE ALSO GONE IN THE LEAD THING TO ENDLESS WORKSHOPS
11 WHERE THE SAME PEOPLE CAME AND SAID THE SAME THINGS OVER
12 AND OVER AND OVER AGAIN; AND I THINK BASED ON THE LAST
13 ONE, THAT'S JUST WHAT YOU'RE GOING TO GET.
14 I THINK IT'S -- THE OTHER THING IS AT THIS
15 POINT IN THE GAME, I THINK THE WRITTEN COMMENTS ARE A LOT
16 MORE USEFUL BECAUSE YOU CAN SIT DOWN WITH THEM, YOU CAN
17 THINK ABOUT THEM, YOU CAN LOOK AT YOUR RESPONSE TO THEM
18 AND MAKE A JUDGMENT.
19 AND I MEAN, I THINK THERE'S A STRONG SENSE ON
20 THE PANEL -- I THINK UNANIMOUS SENSE THAT WE'D LIKE TO SEE
21 THIS THING MOVE FORWARD TO THE S.R.P. REVIEW DRAFT AND
22 INTO NEXT INCARNATION.
23 I'M WONDERING IF IT'S WORTH SUGGESTING BEFORE
24 WE GO PASSING MOTIONS AND WRITING LETTERS, MAYBE OVER
25 LUNCH YOU GUYS COULD TALK TO YOUR VARIOUS POOH-BAHS BACK
0112
01 IN SACRAMENTO AND TRANSMIT THE SENSE OF THE PANEL AND SEE
02 IF MAYBE THEY'D WANT TO RECONSIDER THE SCHEDULING.
03 DO YOU THINK THAT'S AN APPROPRIATE
04 SUGGESTION?
05 DR. PITTS: THAT MAKES SENSE.
06 MS. DENTON: I THINK IF I COULD JUST --
07 DR. PITTS: AND THEN WE CAN --
08 MS. DENTON: WHEN WE'RE TALKING ABOUT WORKSHOPS AND
09 COMMENT PERIODS, WE'RE REALLY TALKING ABOUT THE PUBLIC
10 PROCESS.
11 DR. GLANTZ: RIGHT.
12 MS. DENTON: AND AS A BOARD THAT HAS A REGULATORY
13 PROCESS, WE PRIDE OURSELVES --
14 DR. GLANTZ: RIGHT.
15 MS. DENTON: -- ON PUBLIC COMMENT, PUBLIC INPUT.
16 DR. GLANTZ: RIGHT.
17 MS. DENTON: AND SO IT GOES KIND OF BEYOND THE
18 SCIENCE. THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC TO HAVE A
19 HEARING.
20 DR. GLANTZ: RIGHT. AND, JOAN, I'M NOT SAYING THE
21 PUBLIC SHOULD BE SHUT OUT. THESE MEETINGS ARE OPEN. I'M
22 NOT SAYING THAT WE SHOULD TAKE THIS DOCUMENT AND VOTE ON
23 IT TODAY. I'M -- THERE SHOULD BE ANOTHER PUBLIC COMMENT
24 PERIOD OF THE S.R.P. REVIEW DRAFT OF THE DOCUMENT AND THEY
25 WILL HAVE A CHANCE TO GIVE THEIR INPUT; BUT WE'RE GETTING
0113
01 INTO THIS MODE OF THESE ENDLESS WORKSHOPS AND REVISIONS
02 AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS, AND IT JUST GOES ON AND ON AND
03 ON AND ON.
04 AND I MEAN, I THINK THAT WE'RE -- I AGREE
05 WITH YOU. THIS SHOULD BE AN OPEN PROCESS AND THE PUBLIC
06 SHOULD HAVE A RIGHT TO HAVE THEIR INPUT, BUT LET THEM --
07 LET THE DOCUMENT MOVE FORWARD TO THE S.R.P. REVIEW DRAFT.
08 LET THEM PUT FORWARD THEIR WRITTEN COMMENTS. NO ONE'S

09 EVER SAID THIS COMMITTEE DOESN'T LOOK AT THEM AND --
10 MS. DENTON: WELL, JUST WHAT I WAS GOING TO SAY, WE
11 AT THIS TABLE DID NOT MAKE THAT DECISION, SO PERHAPS OVER
12 LUNCH, WE WILL --
13 DR. PITTS: THAT'S WHAT HE WAS SUGGESTING. TALK TO
14 THE POWERS THAT BE.
15 MS. DENTON: AND THEN MAYBE WE CAN -- THE
16 SPOKESPERSON OF A.R.B. CAN COME BACK AFTER LUNCH.
17 DR. PITTS: SPECIFICALLY AS TO PART A, I'D BE HAPPY
18 FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON IT RIGHT NOW. FROM WHAT I CAN SEE,
19 IT'S FIRST CLASS.
20 MS. DENTON: THANK YOU.
21 DR. PITTS: I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM. WHY GO THROUGH
22 THIS FOR SOME PRELIMINARY RESULTS THAT MAY COME OUT IN
23 JULY OF 1997 FROM SOME ANALYSIS OF GASOLINE OR DIESEL FUEL
24 BEFORE AND AFTER. WELL, THAT'S INTERESTING, BUT THAT'S
25 NOT GOING TO CHANGE THE GENERAL PICTURE, AND THEY'RE
0114
01 PRELIMINARY RESULTS ANYWAY. THEY WON'T BE IN PEER REVIEW
02 LITERATURE. PROBABLY BY THEN IF THE TEST HAS STARTED A
03 WEEK AGO THEN --
04 DR. FROINES: WE KNOW THERE'S NO MAJOR EPIDEMIOLOGY
05 STUDY GOING ON RIGHT NOW. THAT WE KNOW. SO WHAT ELSE IS
06 THERE GOING TO BE FOR US TO SEE THAT IS GOING TO CHANGE
07 ANYTHING? WE'RE GOING TO SEE MAYBE SOME NEW TOXICOGENIC
08 MODELS THAT ARE BASED ON THRESHOLDS AND THAT'S FINE. BUT
09 WE ALL KNOW THAT THE DATA THAT ALLOWS YOU TO DO THOSE
10 MODELS IS STILL THE DATA THAT'S -- THERE'S NOT NEW ANIMAL
11 DATA COMING OUT THAT'S GOING TO BRING US A NEW LEVEL OF
12 SATURABLE CLEARANCE PROCESSES TO STUDY.
13 IN OTHER WORDS, THE POINT THAT SOMEBODY
14 RAISED EARLIER IS ANY NEW SCIENTIFIC DATA THAT'S GOING TO
15 IMPACT THESE PROCESSES -- AND AS FAR AS I KNOW AND I KNOW
16 QUITE A BIT ABOUT THIS, I DON'T KNOW OF ANYTHING GOING
17 ON. THE ONLY THING I KNOW WAS THAT OF THE N.I.O.S.H. AND
18 N.C.I. STUDY AND THAT'S CURRENTLY DEAD IN THE WATER.
19 DR. PITTS: OKAY. ON THOSE COMMENTS -- WELL, DO
20 YOU WANT TO SAY SOMETHING?
21 DR. GLANTZ: I WAS GOING TO SUGGEST IT'S 12:35.
22 LET'S EAT LUNCH AND LET THEM FIND OUT.
23 DR. PITTS: LET'S MOVE AHEAD AND GO TO LUNCH AND
24 READJOURN AT 1:35.
25 DR. FROINES: DID WE GET GEORGE'S COMMENTS?
0115
01 DR. GLANTZ: THANK YOU FOR HANDING THEM OUT,
02 GEORGE.
03 DR. PITTS: WE'LL READJOURN AT --
04 DR. FROINES: THERE IS NEW STUFF. THERE IS SOME
05 NEW DATA IN THE DOCUMENT. THAT I WILL GIVE CREDIT TO.
06 DR. PITTS: THAT'S WHY I'M HAPPY WITH IT. AS FAR
07 AS I'M CONCERNED, YOU STATED THE ART AND IT'S SCIENCE.
08 ALL RIGHT. WE'LL ADJOURN NOW AND THEN WE
09 WILL MEET AGAIN AT 1:40.
10 (LUNCH RECESS)
11 DR. PITTS: WE WILL NOW RECONVENE.
12 I MUST JUST FIRST ASK ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS
13 OR COMMENTS THAT THE PANEL WOULD LIKE TO BRING UP ON THEIR

14 DISCUSSION TODAY? DOES ANYONE HAVE ANY COMMENTS?
15 DR. FROINES: I JUST WANTED TO MAKE ONE
16 CLARIFICATION SO THAT O.E.H.H.A. DOESN'T GET INTO ANY
17 DIFFICULTY. WHEN I QUOTED THE 150,000 CASES OF LUNG
18 CANCER, EXCESS CANCERS, THE ACTUAL NUMBERS RANGED FROM 750
19 TO 150,000.
20 IT RAISED AN ISSUE WHICH I DON'T THINK WE
21 SHOULD TALK ABOUT HERE, BUT I THINK WE SHOULD TALK ABOUT
22 IT AT SOME POINT, WHICH IS HOW ARE WE GOING TO DEAL WITH
23 RANGES LIKE THAT? THAT GOES FROM ALMOST BEING
24 INCONSEQUENTIAL TO BEING VERY CONSEQUENTIAL.
25 AGAIN, 750 IS OVER A 70-YEAR LIFETIME AND SO
0116
01 IF ALL WE'RE LEFT WITH IS A RANGE OF RISK, THE QUESTION IS
02 HOW DO WE THINK ABOUT THAT NUMBER AND THEN HOW DO THE RISK
03 MANAGEMENTS THINK ABOUT THAT NUMBER IN TERMS OF WHAT THEY
04 MAY OR MAY NOT DO?
05 SO I DON'T WANT TO RAISE IT ANY FURTHER. I
06 JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY IT. I DON'T THINK THERE'S ANYBODY
07 HERE FROM THE L.A. TIMES, BUT WE DON'T WANT TO PUT NUMBERS
08 OUT AND THEN HAVE THEM COME BACK AND BITE US IN THE FOOT.
09 DR. GLANTZ: JUST TO THAT POINT, ONE OF THE THINGS
10 THAT I HAD ASKED GEORGE TO DO AS PART OF -- IN CONJUNCTION
11 WITH THE LEAD DOCUMENT WAS TO TRY TO GET JUST THAT POINT,
12 TO PUT A LITTLE TABLE TOGETHER, WHICH WAS PASSED AROUND;
13 AND WAS THE PART OF THE FINDINGS WRITING WHICH DIDN'T MAKE
14 IT IN, BUT WHICH IS IN THE PACKET WHERE HE'S JUST
15 TABULATED THOSE KINDS OF NUMBERS VIA SOME OF THE REPORTS.
16 AND EVEN IF YOU COMPARE THOSE NUMBERS WITH
17 THINGS, BENZENE OR BENZOAPYRENE OR AT LEAST SOME OF THE
18 OTHER THINGS THAT HAVE BEEN LISTED AS TOXIC AIR
19 CONTAMINANTS, YOU'LL SEE THOSE ARE STILL PRETTY BIG
20 NUMBERS, EVEN AT THE LOW END OF THE RANGE.
21 I MEAN, I FIND THIS A USEFUL WAY TO THINK
22 ABOUT THESE THINGS NOW THAT WE'VE GOT ENOUGH OF A UNIVERSE
23 TO DO IT IN. IT MAY BE THAT IN THE FUTURE IN THESE
24 DOCUMENTS SOME SORT OF COMPARISONS MIGHT BE USEFUL TO
25 INCLUDE IN THE DOCUMENTS AS WELL.
0117
01 RIGHT NOW WE HAVE A TABLE COMPARING THE UNIT
02 RISKS, BUT THIS WOULD BE COMPARING THE PUBLIC HEALTH
03 VERSION PRIOR TO ANY REGULATION THE A.R.B. PUT IN PLACE.
04 DR. FROINES: I AGREE WITH YOU. I AGREE WITH YOU,
05 BUT THEN THERE'S ANOTHER PROBLEM THAT I THINK WE -- THIS
06 IS THE "JIM HITS JOHN FROINES" COMPLAINT THAT'S BEEN GOING
07 ON FOR SOME YEARS NOW.
08 I'LL GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE. HERE WE'RE DEALING
09 WITH DIESEL, BUT IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WE HAVE A LOT OF
10 ATMOSPHERIC CHEMISTRY GOING ON THAT PRODUCES NITROAERIN
11 COMPOUNDS. WE'RE NOT DEALING WITH THAT. WE COMPLAINED,
12 BUT WE'RE NOT DEALING WITH IT.
13 THEN WE COME OVER TO HERE TO THIS DOCUMENT
14 WHICH IS MAKING COMPARISONS TO LEAD AND YOU HAVE
15 BENZOPYRENE AND IT SAYS 70 -- 17 TO 52 PEOPLE
16 PER 30 MILLION. WELL, THAT'S NOT THE POINT. THE POINT OF
17 THE ISSUE ISN'T BENZOPYRENE. THE POINT OF ISSUE IS
18 POLYCYCLIC HYDROCARBONS IN WHICH BENZOPYRENE IS ONE OF

19 THEM.
20 SO THIS NUMBER IS VERY MISLEADING BECAUSE
21 THIS DOESN'T GIVE US THE ACTUAL PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS
22 OF THE NUMBERS OF POLYCYCLIC HYDROCARBONS FOR 30 PEOPLE.
23 IT IN ESSENCE GIVES US THE IMPLICATIONS FOR BENZOPYRENE,
24 AND THAT'S CONCERNED ME ALL ALONG BECAUSE THE TROUBLE WITH
25 THIS CHEMICAL-BY-CHEMICAL APPROACH WE TAKE IS WE HAVEN'T
0118
01 FOUND THE FOREST YET.
02 WE STILL HAVE ALL THESE TREES TO WORRY ABOUT,
03 ESPECIALLY THOSE TREES THAT GIVE OFF BENZOPYRENE. BUT
04 SERIOUSLY, I MEAN, I THINK THAT THESE NUMBERS BECOME
05 MISLEADING AND I THINK IT GOES TO THE QUESTION HOW DO WE
06 EVER DEFINE WHAT IS THE, QUOTE, "AIR TOXINS" PROBLEM IN A
07 GEOGRAPHIC AREA? AND I THINK THAT I STILL FEEL IT WOULD
08 BE GOOD IF WE COULD SOME DAY COME TO GRIPS WITH THAT.
09 DR. PITTS: THANK YOU.
10 WELL, GEORGE, WOULD YOU LIKE TO -- YOU HAVE
11 PART B. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON THAT?
12 DR. ALEXEEFF: WELL, I HAD PREPARED THREE SLIDES.
13 I DID PASS OUT COPIES. I DON'T KNOW IF YOU WANT TO SEE
14 THEM OR NOT.
15 DR. PITTS: SURE.
16 DR. FROINES: SURE.
17 DR. PITTS: WE'VE GOT THEM.
18 DR. ALEXEEFF: OKAY. IN JUNE OF 1994, THE PART A
19 AND B WENT OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. IT WAS A SIX-MONTH
20 COMMENT PERIOD AND WE RECEIVED FAIRLY VOLUMINOUS COMMENTS
21 ON OUR DOCUMENT, AND SO TO SUM THEM ALL UP IN ONE SLIDE IS
22 IMPOSSIBLE; BUT WHAT I DID WAS I PUT DOWN WHAT I THOUGHT
23 WERE MAJOR COMMENT AREAS AND JUST FROM MY PERSONAL
24 PERSPECTIVE FROM THE 199- -- THAT COMMENTERS HAD ON OUR
25 DOCUMENT AND THE COMMENTS THAT THEY HAD WERE RELATED TO
0119
01 THE INCONCLUSIVENESS OF THE HUMAN STUDIES AS HAS BEEN
02 ALLUDED TO.
03 OUR DIESEL DOCUMENT WEIGHED A LOT ON THE
04 HUMAN STUDIES, REALLY FOCUSED A LOT OF THE HUMAN STUDIES,
05 AND ONE STUDY IN PARTICULAR.
06 THERE WAS ALSO A NUMBER OF COMMENTS REGARDING
07 THE DIESEL EXHAUST EXPOSURE ESTIMATES OF RAILROAD WORKERS,
08 AND THAT FEEDS INTO THE KEY STUDY THAT WE USED IN OUR
09 ANALYSIS WHICH WAS THE GARSCHICK 1988 COHORT STUDY; AND
10 THERE WERE SOME CONCERNS AND ISSUES RAISED ABOUT THE
11 WEAKNESS OF THAT STUDY AND WE HAVE ALSO ALLUDED TO SOME OF
12 THESE ANIMAL STUDIES AND WHETHER THERE'S OVERLOAD AND
13 WHETHER THE ANIMAL STUDIES ARE APPROPRIATE TO PREDICT
14 HUMAN RISKS.
15 THERE WERE A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS REGARDING
16 MECHANISM OF DIESEL EXHAUST CARCINOGENICITY, AND THEN
17 THERE WERE ALSO COMMENTS REGARDING WHETHER OR NOT WE'RE
18 ACTUALLY PROTECTING SENSITIVE POPULATIONS, ESPECIALLY
19 FEMALES AND THOSE WITH RESPIRATORY IMPAIRMENTS WHO APPEAR
20 TO BE MORE SUSCEPTIBLE.
21 AND IN RESPONSE TO MOST OF THE HUMAN STUDY
22 ISSUES, WE DECIDED WITH A.R.B. AND H.E.I. AND U.S. E.P.A.
23 AND N.I.O.S.H. TO PUT TOGETHER THIS CONFERENCE TO DISCUSS

24 THE EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDIES, BECAUSE U.S. E.P.A. DID NOT
25 HAVE A VERY EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION OF THE EPIDEMIOLOGY
0120
01 STUDIES IN THEIR MAIN BODY; BUT THEY DID REFERENCE A
02 REPORT BY DR. CRUMP THAT HAD BEEN PREPARED A COUPLE OF
03 YEARS BEFORE.
04 YOU MIGHT RECALL THAT DR. CRUMP HAD ANALYZED
05 THAT MAJOR EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDY BY GARSCHICK AND FELT THAT
06 THERE REALLY WAS AN INEFFICIENT RESPONSE TO THE STUDY. IT
07 REALLY COULDN'T BE USED, SO THAT CREATED A SENSE THAT
08 MAYBE OUR RULES WERE DIFFERENT FROM U.S. E.P.A.
09 SO WE HAD THIS LARGE CONFERENCE WHERE WE
10 INVITED THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO APPEARED TO BE THE KEY
11 EXPERTS AND EVEN -- DR. FROINES MENTIONED HE WAS INVOLVED
12 IN ASSISTING US ON THIS CONFERENCE, AND THAT'S THE CASE;
13 AND WE ALSO EVEN INVITED MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WHO
14 COMMENTED HERE ON OUR DOCUMENT TO GIVE US INPUT AS TO
15 WHO -- WHAT EXPERTS WE NEEDED AT THIS CONFERENCE.
16 SO WE FELT IN THE END WE HAD ESSENTIALLY
17 EVERY KEY EXPERT WHO COULD MAKE IT IN PROBABLY THE WORLD,
18 BECAUSE I KNOW WE HAD A NUMBER OF PEOPLE FROM GERMANY AS
19 WELL; BUT WE HAD A FULL DISCUSSION OF THE EPIDEMIOLOGY OF
20 THE EXPOSURE INFORMATION AND THE REANALYSES THAT DR. CRUMP
21 DID AND ALSO MY STAFF DID AS WELL.
22 I THINK THE GENERAL SENSE OF PEOPLE ATTENDING
23 THE CONFERENCE WAS THAT THE HUMAN EPIDEMIOLOGY DATA WAS
24 VERY STRONG. HOW STRONG IT WAS DIFFERED A LITTLE BIT, BUT
25 I THINK THE GENERAL SENSE WAS THAT IT WAS VERY STRONG; AND
0121
01 ALSO THE GENERAL SENSE WAS THAT THE GARSCHICK STUDY, THE
02 ONE THAT WE HAD USED, WAS REALLY THE BEST ONE OF ALL OF
03 THE ONES AVAILABLE.
04 AT THE SAME TIME, THERE WAS A SENSE IF THERE
05 WAS A WAY OF INCLUDING MORE OF THE STUDIES TOGETHER THAT
06 WOULD HELP, BECAUSE FOCUSING ON ONE STUDY OBVIOUSLY EVERY
07 EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY HAS CERTAIN FLAWS.
08 SO THERE WERE SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS MADE TO
09 IMPROVE THE ANALYSES AND THE CONFERENCE ALSO RESULTED IN A
10 CONTINUED DIALOGUE BETWEEN DR. CRUMP AND DR. DAWSON AND MY
11 STAFF TO TRY TO RESOLVE THEIR DIFFERENCES IN THEIR
12 REANALYSIS OF THE DATA SET, AND THE DATA SET IS COMPRISED
13 OF 50,000 RAILROAD WORKERS, SO IT'S A FAIRLY RICH DATA SET
14 AND IT'S A COMPLICATED SET BECAUSE DIESELIZATION WAS
15 OCCURRING DURING THAT -- WAS OCCURRING DURING THE TIME OF
16 THAT COHORT.
17 SO THERE ARE SOME QUESTIONS THAT CAN BE
18 RESOLVED AND THERE ARE WAYS OF ANALYZING IT THAT YOU CAN
19 COME UP WITH SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT RESULTS. SO WE WANTED TO
20 USE THE BEST SCIENCE TO COME UP WITH THE RESULT, AND THAT
21 WAS PART OF THE PURPOSE OF THIS CONFERENCE.
22 THE LAST SLIDE TALKS ABOUT THE MAJOR AREAS
23 THAT WE'RE WORKING ON IN REVISING THIS DOCUMENT OF WHICH
24 ONE IS WE ARE -- THERE ARE A LOT OF COMMENTS REGARDING
25 CLARIFICATION OF ISSUES, SO THERE'S A NUMBER OF
0122
01 CLARIFICATIONS THROUGHOUT THE DOCUMENT THAT WE'RE PUTTING
02 IN AND UPDATING THE SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION ON TOXIKINETICS

03 (PHONETIC), GENOTOXICITY AND THAT WILL HELP US IN THE
04 MECHANISM INFORMATION AND A REVIEW OF THE CARCINOGENICITY
05 STUDIES. THERE ARE A FEW ANIMAL STUDIES THAT HAVE
06 OCCURRED SINCE THEN.
07 WE'RE ALSO INCREASING THE DISCUSSION OF THE
08 NONCANCER HEALTH EFFECTS, ALTHOUGH WE DON'T REALLY GET
09 INTO THE P.M. ISSUE.
10 WE'VE INCORPORATED THE MAJOR SUGGESTIONS FROM
11 THE WORKSHOP AND WE ALSO HAVE A SUMMARY OF THE DIFFERENCES
12 BETWEEN DR. CRUMP AND DR. DAWSON AND TRIED TO EXPLAIN WHY
13 TWO REPUTABLE SCIENTISTS CAN COME TO DIFFERENT CONCLUSIONS
14 AND TRY TO PINPOINT WHAT THE DIFFERENT ASSUMPTIONS ARE
15 THAT HAVE RESULTED IN THOSE DIFFERENT CONCLUSIONS. WE'VE
16 TRIED TO JUST LAY IT OUT THERE.
17 AND ALSO THERE IS -- WE HAVE ADDED -- WE'RE
18 ADDING A META-ANALYSIS OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SETTING, AND
19 THAT GIVES US A BETTER SENSE AS TO THE TOTAL STRENGTH OF
20 THE HUMAN DATA AND HOW THE DATA ALL FITS TOGETHER, HOW
21 DOES THIS GARSCHICK STUDY FIT WITH THE OTHER STUDIES. SO
22 THERE ARE ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES OF BOTH ANIMAL RISK AND
23 HUMAN RISK; AND IN OUR DOCUMENT, AS DR. FROINES MENTIONED,
24 WE REALLY ARE FOCUSING ON THE RANGE AT THIS POINT, THE
25 RANGE OF RISKS THAT WE FIND FROM ALL THESE STUDIES, WHICH
0123
01 IS WHAT IS REQUIRED IN THE STATUTE.
02 DR. SEIBER: GEORGE, I HAVE A QUESTION. I THINK I
03 HEARD YOU BEFORE THE LUNCH BREAK SAY SOMETHING ABOUT
04 CALIFORNIA AND FEDERAL E.P.A. WERE, YOU KNOW, DOING SUCH
05 ANALYSES THAT WERE BRINGING THEM CLOSER TOGETHER?
06 DR. ALEXEEFF: RIGHT.
07 DR. SEIBER: DOES THAT MEAN IN THE UNIT RISK OR THE
08 POTENCY FACTOR? IS THAT WHERE THE MAJOR DIFFERENCE IS? I
09 THINK THERE WAS QUITE A LOT, AT LEAST A LARGE PERCEIVED
10 DIFFERENCE.
11 DR. ALEXEEFF: WELL, PREVIOUSLY, WE HAD THE SAME
12 RANGE OF RISKS, BUT EACH ORGANIZATION IDENTIFIED A
13 SPECIFIC BEST ESTIMATE WITHIN THAT RANGE. WE IDENTIFIED A
14 HUMAN STUDY; WE IDENTIFIED AN ANIMAL STUDY. SO THAT'S
15 WHAT THE DIFFERENCE WAS.
16 NOW, BOTH ORGANIZATIONS WILL BE FOCUSING ON
17 THE RANGE OF RISKS AND SO THERE -- IT'S OUR UNDERSTANDING
18 THAT WE'LL HAVE THE SAME CONCLUSIONS AS TO WHAT THE RISK
19 IS, UNDERSTANDING THAT THAT RISK AND A LOT OF THAT CAME
20 ABOUT AS A RESULT OF THIS CONFERENCE. WE GOT TO SEE EACH
21 OTHER'S GROUPS' STRENGTHS, AND SO WE HAVE BEEN KEEPING IN
22 TOUCH TO GET AN UNDERSTANDING AS TO HOW THE DOCUMENTS ARE
23 GOING, AND NOW WE HAVE A MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING WHICH
24 HAS JUST BEEN EXECUTED, I BELIEVE, LAST WEEK WITH U.S.
25 E.P.A. WITH THIS PARTICULAR PART.
0124
01 THIS IS ONE OF THE AFOREMENTIONED IN THE
02 PACKET THAT WE'RE WORKING ON, AND I BELIEVE I'VE BEEN TOLD
03 IT'S BEEN FINALIZED. IF NOT, IT'S VERY CLOSE TO BEING
04 FINALIZED. THAT IS ALSO HELPING US BY SHARING INFORMATION
05 TO, YOU KNOW, MAKE SURE WE ALL HAVE THE SAME INFORMATION
06 AND HAVE THE SAME KIND OF APPROACH. IT WON'T BE THE SAME
07 DOCUMENT, BUT THE RANGE OF RISKS ARE THE SAME.

08 DR. PITTS: ARE THERE COMMENTS?
09 DR. FROINES: THERE'S BEEN A LOT OF DISCUSSION
10 ABOUT MECHANISM OF DIESEL CARCINOGENICITY AND STROBERS
11 (PHONETIC) AND OTHERS HAVE DEVELOPED A THRESHOLD WHICH
12 THREW UP A MODEL BASED ON THEIR UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT THEY
13 THINK IS THE MECHANISM.
14 THERE'S CLEARLY GENOTOXICITY DATA AND D.N.A.
15 EVIDENCE DATA, SO THERE ARE A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT
16 POSSIBILITIES FOR THE MECHANISM AND EACH ONE HAS
17 IMPLICATIONS TO RISK ASSESSMENT, BUT I HAVEN'T SEEN IN
18 HERE WHERE YOU'VE ACTUALLY TAKEN THE DIFFERENT MECHANISTIC
19 CHOICES AND SAID, "HERE ARE THE IMPLICATIONS OF THOSE
20 CHOICES AND HERE'S WHAT WE HAVE CONCLUDED."
21 DR. ALEXEEFF: YEAH. THERE IS A DISCUSSION IN THE
22 DOCUMENT ON VARIOUS MECHANISTIC CHOICES. WE HAVEN'T
23 CARRIED THEM THROUGH TO ALL THE DIFFERENT POSSIBILITIES,
24 LIKE TO CREATE A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT MODELS; BUT WE ARE
25 ADDING A -- WHICH CAME OUT OF THE CONFERENCE -- MORE
0125
01 BIOLOGICALLY-BASED RISK ASSESSMENT NUMBER, AS WELL AS ONE
02 THAT'S MORE OF A CALCULATION WHICH IS MORE MECHANISTICALLY
03 BASED, AND IT'S STILL WITHIN THE RANGE.
04 DR. FROINES: BUT IT DEPENDS ON WHAT MECHANISMS YOU
05 SELECT.
06 DR. ALEXEEFF: YES.
07 DR. FROINES: ARE YOU GOING TO MAKE A JUDGMENT IN
08 THAT SENSE?
09 DR. ALEXEEFF: NO. I THINK JUST TO BE CONSISTENT
10 WITH OUR OTHER -- WITH BOTH THE WAY THE STATUTE IS WRITTEN
11 AND THE WAY OUR OTHER DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN DONE, WE DO HAVE
12 TO EVALUATE WHETHER OR NOT WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO IDENTIFY A
13 THRESHOLD AND, YOU KNOW, WE HAVEN'T.
14 AND THEN AT THE SAME TIME, ALTHOUGH THERE
15 COULD BE CERTAIN ASPECTS OF A -- LET'S SEE. IF YOU
16 IDENTIFY A -- I'M SORRY. LET ME GO BACK HERE ONE SECOND.
17 WE DO DISCUSS THE ISSUE OF IDENTIFYING A
18 THRESHOLD; BUT IN TERMS OF EVALUATING CANCER RISK, THE
19 THRESHOLD INFORMATION MOSTLY COMES OUT OF THE ANIMAL DATA
20 AND THEREFORE IT ENDS UP BEING SORT OF A PROBLEM IN THAT
21 IF YOU'RE INCLUDING HUMANS AS PART OF THE RISK RANGE, THE
22 THRESHOLD MODEL FROM THE ANIMAL DATA DOES NOT SEEM TO
23 APPLY TO THE HUMANS, WHICH FROM THE HUMAN DATA YOU GET
24 HIGHER RISKS AND THEN THERE IS A LARGE BODY OF INFORMATION
25 SHOWING THAT IT'S GENOTOXIC.
0126
01 SO OUR CONCLUSION IS THAT THERE MAY BE
02 SEVERAL MECHANISMS WORKING AT THE SAME TIME, JUST AS I
03 THINK CIGARETTE SMOKE HAS VARIOUS MECHANISMS WORKING
04 BECAUSE IT'S A VERY COMPLEX MIXTURE, AND DEPENDING ON THE
05 ANIMAL MODEL AND THE STUDY DESIGN, YOU CAN SORT OF
06 ACCENTUATE DIFFERENT ASPECTS THE WAY IT'S WORKING AS A
07 CARCINOGEN.
08 SO WE HAVEN'T REALLY SAID THAT THERE'S NO
09 CHANCE OF A THRESHOLD, BUT WE SAID WE HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO
10 IDENTIFY A THRESHOLD AND THERE'S ENOUGH INFORMATION ON THE
11 GENOTOXIC SIDE THAT WE CAN TREAT IT AS A GENOTOXIC
12 PERSON. THAT'S OUR GENERAL SENSE.

13 WE DO DISCUSS -- WE WILL BE DISCUSSING IT
14 MORE THAN WE DID IN THE PREVIOUS DRAFT, THE VARIOUS
15 MECHANISTIC CHOICES THAT ONE MIGHT HAVE.
16 DR. PITTS: ARE THERE OTHER COMMENTS?
17 WELL, NOW, FROM OUR DISCUSSIONS, IT APPEARS
18 THAT THERE'S A CERTAIN MESSAGE OR THOUGHT GENERATED.
19 IDEAS HAVE BEEN GENERATED IN THE COURSE OF OUR DISCUSSION
20 AND I AGAIN WANT TO EXPRESS OUR APPRECIATION TO THIS PANEL
21 IN GENERATING DISCUSSION ON A VERY TIMELY TOPIC.
22 THE QUESTION ARISES, HOW WOULD WE LIKE TO --
23 WOULD WE LIKE TO SOMEHOW, NOT NECESSARILY FORMAL -- IN AN
24 INFORMAL DIRECT LETTER EXPRESS OUR FACT, IN FACT, THE GOOD
25 NEWS THAT THESE DOCUMENTS ARE REALLY WELL ALONG AND THEN
0127
01 IN THE CONTEXT OF OUR EARLIER DISCUSSIONS THE NEED OR
02 THE -- YEAH -- THE REAL NEED AND THE DESIRABILITY AND THE
03 NEED TO EXPEDITE THE -- THIS WHOLE PROCESS AND NONE OTHER
04 THAN PERHAPS FOLLOWING THE TIMETABLE, WHICH IT'S CLEARLY
05 POINTED OUT ENDS UP SOMETIME IN 1998, THAT IT'S NOT DEEMED
06 TO BE AS SCIENTIFICALLY A PROBLEM THAT WE COULD MOVE AHEAD
07 NOW?
08 I DON'T THINK WE ASSUME THAT'S THE CASE IF
09 I'M RIGHT ABOUT THAT. THE BASIC SCIENCE, THE
10 FUNDAMENTALS, ARE THERE. WE DO PROVIDE A PROVISION IF
11 THESE ARE BROUGHT TO PUBLIC COMMENT, AND SOON, SHOULD
12 STRIKING NEW RESULTS COME OUT IN VARIOUS AREAS, THAT
13 THERE'S WAYS TO INCORPORATE THOSE IN THE PROCESS, IN THE
14 OVERALL PROCESS; AND THAT THAT BEING THE CASE, MY
15 IMPRESSION IS WE'D LIKE TO COMMUNICATE PERHAPS AS
16 INFORMALLY IN A LETTER TO PERHAPS TO THE CHAIR OF THE
17 A.R.B. THAT THOSE ARE OUR VIEWS ON THE CURRENT STATUS AS
18 WE'VE SEEN IT FROM THE REVIEWS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE
19 BASICALLY AND THEN HEARD FROM THE DISCUSSION TODAY.
20 I'D LIKE THE OPINION OF THE PANEL ON THAT AND
21 PERHAPS SOME SUGGESTIONS TO HOW YOU WANT TO PHRASE THIS
22 LETTER, IF THIS IS WHAT YOU LIKE. IS THERE AN AGREEMENT
23 THAT WE MIGHT MAKE A COMMUNICATION? YES?
24 DR. SEIBER: I THINK THAT WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA AND
25 EVEN ADD A TARGET DATE, BUT THAT WILL DEPEND PARTLY ON
0128
01 WHEN THE STAFF CAN ACTUALLY HAVE THE VERSION OF THE REPORT
02 ACTUALLY READY TO DISTRIBUTE.
03 DO YOU NEED A MONTH OR TWO MONTHS?
04 DR. PITTS: WHAT WOULD BE -- LET'S ASK THE
05 QUESTION. WHEN -- IF WE WENT ALONG THAT BASIS WITH THE
06 CAVEATS THAT WE'VE STRESSED, WHAT WOULD BE A REASONABLE
07 TIME TO SAY --
08 DR. GLANTZ: THIS IS JUST TO BE CLEAR ON THE
09 QUESTION. THIS WOULD BE A REASONABLE TIME TO HAVE THE
10 DOCUMENT, THE DRAFT DOCUMENT, RELEASED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT,
11 NOT FINISHED.
12 MS. DENTON: ARE YOU CONSIDERING THIS AN EXTRA
13 VERSION THAT WOULD BE RELEASED AS THE S.R.P. VERSION?
14 DR. GLANTZ: YES.
15 MS. DENTON: IN THAT CASE, I THINK IT'S REASONABLE
16 TO LOOK FOR IT RELEASED EARLY NEXT SUMMER.
17 DR. GLANTZ: WHAT? WHAT?

18 MS. DENTON: LET ME EXPLAIN, BECAUSE WE HAD
19 ANTICIPATED BASICALLY WE WOULD BE GOING WITH THE SCHEDULE
20 THAT I HAD SHOWED BEFORE, WITH THE EXCEPTION THAT INSTEAD
21 OF FOR A SECOND COMMENT PERIOD IT WOULD BE THE S.R.P.
22 VERSION.
23 GEORGE PROBABLY NEEDS TO ADDRESS THE HEALTH
24 PART, BUT WE WERE ANTICIPATING UPDATING WHAT WE HAVE WITH
25 OUR NEW IMPACT MODEL, WITH SOME POPULATION
0129
01 CHARACTERISTICS, AND JUST UPDATING IT TO MATCH THE RELEASE
02 DATE FOR O.E.H.H.A.
03 AM I NOT -- ARE YOU THINKING OF RELEASING
04 THIS VERSION HERE? IT WON'T BE THE MOST CURRENT VERSION,
05 SO WHAT I WAS LOOKING AT WAS RELEASING THE MOST CURRENT
06 VERSION AS THE S.R.P. VERSION THE NEXT COMMENT PERIOD.
07 DR. GLANTZ: RIGHT. BUT WE'VE JUST SAT HERE AND
08 JIM AND JOHN SAID THIS LOOKS PRETTY GOOD. I MEAN, I WAS
09 EXPECTING YOU TO SAY, "OH, A MONTH."
10 MS. DENTON: IF WE WENT WITH THE PART A WHICH IS --
11 WHICH WILL NOT HAVE OUR MOST RECENT IMPACT MODEL AND WILL
12 NOT REPRESENT THE 10 TO 20 PERCENT, THEN IT'S PROBABLY
13 REASONABLE TO HAVE IT EARLY NEXT YEAR.
14 I DON'T KNOW ABOUT YOU, GEORGE.
15 THAT WOULD BE THE S.R.P. VERSION, AND THE
16 S.R.P. VERSION IS THE VERSION THAT GOES TO THE BOARD. I
17 GUESS WE'RE IN THE DILEMMA OF WHAT DO WE INCLUDE, FOR OUR
18 PART, AS THE LATEST IMPACT DATA AND THE POPULATION DATA?
19 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, YOU DON'T HAVE THE DATA.
20 MS. DENTON: WELL, WE HAVE THE DATA, BUT IT TAKES
21 TIME TO PUT IT THROUGH THE VARIOUS MODELS THAT WE HAVE,
22 AND WE HAVE TO REWRITE BASICALLY THOSE PORTIONS IN PART A.
23 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, HOW MUCH DIFFERENCE DO YOU
24 EXPECT IT WOULD MAKE?
25 MS. DENTON: 10 TO 20 PERCENT.
0130
01 DR. GLANTZ: OH, THAT'S NOT WORTH WAITING FOR, FOR
02 10 PERCENT. I MEAN, EVEN IF YOU'RE IN A FACTOR OF TWO IN
03 THESE UNCERTAINTIES, PEOPLE JUMP UP AND DOWN AND TALK
04 ABOUT HOW PRECISE IT IS.
05 DR. ALEXEEFF: I THINK FROM OUR STANDPOINT, I THINK
06 WE'RE SHOOTING FOR AN APRIL RELEASE FOLLOWING OUR INTERNAL
07 REVIEW, GETTING COMMENTS BACK, AND JUST REVISING IT AND
08 HAVING DUPLICATION FROM, YOU KNOW -- FINALIZING THE
09 DOCUMENT WITH THE A.R.B.
10 DR. PITTS: BY APRIL?
11 MS. DENTON: WELL, APRIL WOULD BE THE SUBMITTAL,
12 SENDING IT TO --
13 DR. PITTS: WOULD BE WHAT?
14 MS. DENTON: WOULD ACTUALLY BE THE -- YOU KNOW, THE
15 PHYSICAL DELIVERY OF THE DOCUMENT TO A.R.B. THAT'S WHAT
16 HE'S SAYING ABOUT THE O.E.H.H.A.
17 DR. GLANTZ: YEAH. BUT JOHN JUST SAID HE LOOKED AT
18 IT AND IT LOOKS PRETTY GOOD. I MEAN, WHY IS THIS TAKING
19 FOUR MORE MONTHS TO GIVE IT TO US? I MEAN, THIS IS CRAZY.
20 DR. ALEXEEFF: WELL, IF -- I'M VERY GLAD THAT OF
21 WHAT DR. FROINES HAS SEEN HE'S VERY POSITIVE ABOUT THE
22 DOCUMENT. AT THE SAME TIME, THIS IS JUST BASED UPON THE

23 KINDS OF COMMENTS WE WERE EXPECTING AND HOW MUCH TIME WE
24 THOUGHT WE WOULD NEED TO MAKE CORRECTIONS FOR INTERNAL
25 COMMENTS. I MEAN, THAT'S THE BASIS OF OUR ESTIMATE.
0131
01 IF IT TURNS OUT THE INTERNAL COMMENTS ARE NOT
02 VERY EXTENSIVE, THEN IT WILL GO MUCH FASTER. PART OF IT
03 IS GIVING PEOPLE A SPECIFIC TIME FRAME TO REVIEW, SO YOU
04 CAN GIVE IT TO SOMEONE TO REVIEW. IF YOU GIVE THEM A
05 THICK DOCUMENT, YOU DON'T WANT TO SAY, "GIVE IT TO ME NEXT
06 WEEK."
07 DR. GLANTZ: YOU DO THAT TO US ALL THE TIME.
08 DR. ALEXEEFF: WE AT LEAST GIVE YOU TEN DAYS. IT
09 DEPENDS.
10 DR. GLANTZ: IT'S LIKE, "WE FAXED YOU 300 PAGES
11 LAST NIGHT. YOU HAVEN'T READ IT YET?"
12 DR. ALEXEEFF: SO IT'S A TURNAROUND FROM THE
13 INDIVIDUAL. BUT ASSUMING WE GET COMMENTS BACK, THEN WE
14 JUST BUILT IN SOME TIME TO REVIEW IT; BUT IF THE COMMENTS
15 ARE NOT THAT EXTENSIVE OR ARE EASY TO ADDRESS, THEN WE
16 CAN --
17 DR. FROINES: YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT COMMENTS FROM
18 ME AND COMMENTS FROM YOUR MANAGEMENT?
19 DR. ALEXEEFF: UH-HUH.
20 DR. VANCE: AS PART OF OUR INTERNAL REVIEW, WE
21 JUST MENTIONED WE HAVE AN M.O.U. WITH U.S. E.P.A. THIS
22 DOCUMENT HAS BEEN SENT TO THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR
23 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THEIR EVALUATION WITH A PLEA
24 THAT THEY FINISH BY DECEMBER 31ST. I ASKED FOR ALL
25 COMMENTS BACK TO ME BY DECEMBER 31ST.
0132
01 DR. FROINES: TO YOU?
02 DR. VANCE: YES, SIR.
03 DR. FROINES: THAT'S E.P.A.?
04 DR. PITTS: GOOD FOR YOU.
05 DR. VANCE: YES.
06 DR. GLANTZ: WOULD IT BE REASONABLE IN LIGHT OF
07 THAT TO REQUEST -- I MEAN, OBVIOUSLY YOU NEED THE TIME TO
08 DO A GOOD JOB, BUT FOR US TO SAY, IT SEEMS REASONABLE TO
09 US THAT YOU OUGHT TO BE ABLE TO HAVE THE S.R.P. PUBLIC
10 REVIEW DRAFT OF THIS OUT MAYBE BY MARCH 1ST, THAT GIVES
11 YOU TWO MONTHS AFTER E.P.A.
12 THE OTHER THING IS ALL THESE PEOPLE YOU GIVE
13 IT TO TO COMMENT ON WILL WAIT BEFORE THE DAY IT'S DUE TO
14 LOOK AT IT ANYWAY, WHETHER YOU GIVE THEM THREE MONTHS OR
15 THREE DAYS. THAT'S BASIC -- THE LAW OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR.
16 SO WOULD IT BE REASONABLE FOR US TO SUGGEST --
17 DR. PITTS: YES.
18 DR. GLANTZ: -- YOU KNOW, MARCH 1ST FOR THE THING
19 TO GO OUT TO THE PUBLIC? YOU SHOULD SORT OF SHOOT FOR
20 THAT AS A DATE WITH SOME REASONABLE PUBLIC COMMENT AND A
21 WHILE FOR YOU TO REACT TO THAT AND THEN IT WOULD COME
22 BEFORE US AND AFTER A REASONABLE COMMENT PERIOD. I DON'T
23 THINK SIX MONTHS IS REASONABLE. A COUPLE OF TWO OR THREE
24 MONTHS.
25 MS. DENTON: YOU'RE JUST REQUESTING THE NEXT
0133
01 VERSION BE THE S.R.P. VERSION?

02 DR. GLANTZ: YEAH.
03 DR. PITTS: YES. AND THEN THE NEXT ONE MARCH 1ST,
04 AND THEN WE'RE ALL PREPARED TO INTERACT INFORMALLY, OF
05 COURSE, AS THINGS ARISE AND IN PREPARATION OF THIS DRAFT.
06 NOW THAT IT'S GOING TO MOVE FOR PUBLIC, WE WILL HAVE READ
07 IT AGAIN AND THEN ANY COMMENTS CAN COME IN AT THAT TIME
08 AND WE'LL BE PREPARED TO HAVE -- WE ARE PLANNING OUR NEXT
09 MEETING. WE'LL BE WORKING ON AN AGENDA NOW AND NEXT
10 MEETING WILL BE SOMEWHERE AROUND MARCH 1ST, PERHAPS
11 FEBRUARY 1ST.
12 SOMEWHERE IN THAT TIME FRAME OF FEBRUARY AND
13 MARCH 1ST, WE ARE SCHEDULING A MEETING AND IT'S OUR
14 GENERAL IMPRESSION -- I WON'T BE TOTALLY SPECIFIC -- IN
15 THE INTEREST OF MOVING THE PROCESS ALONG AND IN THE
16 INTEREST OF NOT ONLY THE EXISTING PROCESSES BUT THE NEW
17 ONES AS THEY'RE COMING DOWN THE PIPE MOVING THINGS ALONG.
18 WE ARE CONTEMPLATING AND WE WILL PROBABLY INSTITUTE
19 MEETING REGULARLY, NOT SPECIFICALLY ON THESE TOPICS, BUT
20 EVERY TWO OR THREE MONTHS.
21 THIS IS WHAT WE DID FOR A DECADE AND IT
22 WORKED OUT QUITE WELL ON ALL SIDES AND WE'RE HAPPY --
23 PLEASED TO BE DEALING WITH THIS AND IT PROBABLY COULD BE
24 OF ASSISTANCE TO YOU IN YOUR TIMETABLES IN THE SENSE OF IT
25 WOULD BE A MEANS OF ASSISTING YOU GETTING IT OUT.
0134
01 MARCH 1ST? IS THAT A REASONABLE -- I SEE PLEAS,
02 NODS AND HAPPY --
03 MS. DENTON: I WOULD JUST --
04 DR. PITTS: PEOPLE. THAT WOULD WORK FOR THEM.
05 MS. DENTON: I WOULD JUST COMMENT TO YOU THAT IF
06 THE PANEL COULD WRITE US THE LETTER AND THEN -- WITH THE
07 DATES THAT YOU THINK ARE APPROPRIATE; AND IF IT'S PLUS OR
08 MINUS A COUPLE OF MONTHS EITHER WAY, WE WOULD GET BACK TO
09 YOU ON THE RATIONALE FOR THE TIME SCHEDULE --
10 DR. PITTS: SURE.
11 MS. DENTON: -- OR WHATEVER; BUT AGAIN, IT'S KIND
12 OF A -- WE CAN'T REALLY SAY IN ALL APPROPRIATENESS -- I
13 THINK YOU COULD GIVE US OUR BEST --
14 DR. GLANTZ: THE OTHER THING I WOULD POINT OUT --
15 AND THIS CAME UP WHEN WE WERE TALKING OVER LUNCH IS ONE OF
16 THE THINGS I THOUGHT WAS VERY IMPRESSIVE ABOUT A.B. 1807
17 IF YOU GO BACK AND READ IT, IT EXPLICITLY POINTED OUT THAT
18 YOU NEVER KNOW THE ANSWERS FOR SURE AND THERE'S ALWAYS
19 UNCERTAINTY, AND I BELIEVE IT EXPLICITLY SAYS "NOT HAVING
20 THE PERFECT ANSWER IS NOT A REASON TO NOT MOVE FORWARD."
21 SO I THINK THAT YOU CAN ALWAYS MAKE IT BETTER
22 BY TAKING LONGER, BUT THE QUESTION IS WILL YOU REALLY MAKE
23 IT ANY DIFFERENT? AND I THINK WE'RE NOW UP -- THAT IS THE
24 SPIRIT OF THIS WHOLE PROCESS, THAT THIS PROCESS HAD MOVED
25 FORWARD VERY PRODUCTIVELY FOR A LONG TIME, AND I THINK
0135
01 WHAT YOU'RE HEARING HERE IS GETTING BACK TO THAT.
02 THAT DOESN'T MEAN WE DON'T WANT PUBLIC INPUT
03 OR COMMENT. WE JUST WANT THINGS MOVING ON EXPEDITIOUSLY
04 IN THE SPIRIT OF THE THINGS.
05 I'LL SUGGEST THAT THE CHAIR WRITE A LETTER TO
06 CHAIRMAN DUNLOP SAYING, "WE WOULD HOPE THEY COULD HAVE THE

07 S.R.P. PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT OF THE DIESEL REPORT RELEASED
08 TO THE PUBLIC BY MARCH 1ST." "HOPE," NOT "DEMAND." "WE
09 HOPE FOR A REASONABLE PUBLIC COMMENT OF, YOU KNOW, TWO TO
10 THREE MONTHS," WHICH WOULD SEEM TO ME WOULD BE REASONABLE,
11 AND THEN IT WOULD JUST MOVE FORWARD AS IT DID BEFORE.
12 YOU KNOW, I THINK SIX MONTHS IS JUST -- IF
13 YOU PUT IT OUT FOR SIX MONTHS, AFTER FIVE MONTHS AND 28
14 DAYS, PEOPLE WILL START HYSTERICALLY WRITING THEIR
15 REQUESTS FOR EXTENSIONS BECAUSE THEY HAVEN'T FINISHED
16 THEIR ANALYSIS. SO YOU MIGHT AS WELL GET THE EXTENSION AT
17 THE BEGINNING.
18 MS. DENTON: LET ME JUST COMMENT ON THE SIX-MONTH
19 COMMENT PERIOD. THE WAY IT EVOLVED, WE ACTUALLY SENT IT
20 OUT FOR A THREE-MONTH PERIOD AND THEN PEOPLE REQUESTED AN
21 AMOUNT OF TIME. SO WHEN IT WAS ALL SAID AND DONE, IT WAS
22 A TOTAL OF SIX MONTHS. WE DIDN'T ORIGINALLY PLAN TO HAVE
23 SIX MONTHS.
24 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, I WOULD HOPE THAT THIS TIME --
25 MAYBE WHEN YOU SEND OUT YOUR NOTICE, YOU COULD INCLUDE THE
0136
01 DEMAND FOR EXTENSION AND THEY COULD APPLY FOR IT RIGHT AT
02 THE BEGINNING AND ASK FOR A THREE-MONTH EXTENSION FROM THE
03 INITIAL DATE, WHICH WOULD GIVE YOU TO THE TERMINAL DATE.
04 DR. FRIEDMAN: WELL, THEN YOU'RE GIVING THEM
05 PERMISSION TO SEND US THINGS THAT WE CAN ADVANCE BECAUSE
06 YOU'RE SAYING EVERY HUMAN BEING PUTS THINGS OFF TO THE
07 LAST MINUTE.
08 DR. GLANTZ: BUT THEY DO THAT EVERYWHERE.
09 DR. PITTS: IS THERE -- IS THAT IN LINE WITH THE
10 GENERAL THINKING OF -- I DON'T THINK WE NEED TO HAVE A
11 MOTION ON THIS. I WOULD SAY IN LINE WITH THE PUBLIC
12 COMMENT, IT'S -- IT IS REALLY IMPORTANT THAT WHEN WE
13 SAY -- IF WE SHOULD SAY TWO MONTHS OR THREE MONTHS, WE
14 WANT TO BE VERY SURE THAT THE U.S. MAIL IS NOT NECESSARILY
15 THE RATE-DETERMINING STEP, BUT THAT THE PROCESS OF THE
16 NOTIFYING PUBLIC COMMENT WILL START AT A TIME WHEREIN THEY
17 RECEIVE THIS. OTHERWISE, BY THE TIME THEY RECEIVE IT FOR
18 THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD, TWO WEEKS HAS ALREADY PASSED.
19 YOU'RE FAMILIAR WITH THAT.
20 SOME CASES, YOU HAVE UNTIL JUNE SUCH AND SUCH
21 TO GET YOUR COMMENTS IN AND IT ISN'T THE ORIGINAL IDEA OF
22 BEING A MONTH OR SOMETHING BECAUSE TIME HAS BEEN TAKEN --
23 IT ISN'T A TIME -- IT SHOULD BE TWO MONTHS AFTER THEY GET
24 THE DOCUMENT. THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO SAY IN A LITTLE
25 MORE CLEAR WORDS.
0137
01 THE PUBLIC DESERVES THIS AND THEY SHOULD ON
02 ALL ACCOUNTS GET THAT, AND SO LET'S BE SURE THAT YOU SET
03 THE TIME PERIOD SUCH THAT THEY WILL RECEIVE THE DOCUMENT
04 IN TIME A, AND FROM TIME B --
05 DR. GLANTZ: YOU MIGHT EVEN -- IF THIS IS AN ISSUE,
06 SINCE WE'RE TRYING TO NAIL A SCHEDULE DOWN, SINCE YOU KNOW
07 PRETTY MUCH WHO ARE THE MOST INTERESTED PEOPLE, YOU COULD
08 EVEN A MONTH BEFORE YOU ANTICIPATE THE DOCUMENT COMING OUT
09 SEND THEM A LETTER SAYING, "HEY, WE'RE GOING TO BE
10 RELEASING THIS ON MARCH 1ST OR WHATEVER, SO," YOU KNOW,
11 "BE STANDING IN LINE THAT MORNING TO GET YOURS PROMPTLY."

12 I THINK THE BOTTOM LINE OF THIS IS PEOPLE
13 WANT TO SEE THE PROCESS MOVE FORWARD EXPEDITIOUSLY AND NOT
14 HAVE ALL THESE DELAYS, CAUSE IT'S JUST GOTTEN OUT OF HAND.
15 DR. FROINES: WELL, THERE'S ANOTHER LEVEL THAT'S
16 GOTTEN BAD TOO. AND THAT IS, AS I THINK ABOUT THE
17 CARCINOGENIC IDENTIFICATION COMMITTEE AND OUR COMMITTEE,
18 IT SEEMS TO ME THAT UNLIKE WHAT HAPPENED WHEN I FIRST CAME
19 ON THIS COMMITTEE WHEN WE ACTUALLY SPENT TIME TALKING
20 ABOUT THE CONTENT OF THE DOCUMENTS, YOU KNOW, WE HAD
21 SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSIONS.
22 WE TALKED ABOUT UNCERTAINTIES IN
23 TOXICOLOGICAL KINETIC FINDINGS. WE ACTUALLY ACTED AS
24 SCIENTISTS.
25
0138
01 AS FAR AS I CAN TELL, I'VE SPENT TODAY
02 DOING -- TALKING PROCEDURALLY. YOU DON'T NEED ME TO DO
03 THAT AND YOU DON'T NEED ANY OF US HERE TO DO THAT. WE
04 HAVE TO GET IN A TIME WHERE OUR TIMETABLES AND PROCEDURES
05 ARE CAREFULLY LAID OUT IN ADVANCE AND WE KNOW WHAT'S GOING
06 TO HAPPEN AND WE CAN TALK ABOUT THE SUBSTANCE OF THOSE
07 DOCUMENTS.
08 OTHERWISE, I ASSUME THAT WE'RE ON THIS
09 COMMITTEE BECAUSE THEY THINK AIR POLLUTION IS A PROBLEM OF
10 THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND THEREFORE WE SHOULD BE AT THOSE
11 ISSUES, NOT ALWAYS DEALING WITH HOW TO MAKE THE PROCESS A
12 LONGER, MORE TEDIOUS PROCESS, AND THAT'S WHAT IT'S BECOME,
13 FRANKLY.
14 MS. DENTON: I WAS GOING TO COMMENT ON SOMETHING
15 ELSE AND THAT WAS THAT WE HAD QUITE A DISCUSSION ABOUT THE
16 WORKSHOP AND THE RULE OF THE WORKSHOP, AND JUST SO THAT,
17 YOU KNOW, THE OPINION OF THE PANEL IS DIRECTLY KNOWN AND
18 WE KNOW YOUR OPINION IS MADE CLEAR.
19 IT SEEMED TO ME THAT IT WOULD WORK OUT BEST
20 IF THE DETAILS OF HOW THAT VERSION, SAY, IS RELEASED.
21 USUALLY WE RELEASE IT -- WE USUALLY BRIEF THE INTERESTED
22 PARTIES THE WEEK BEFORE, SO WE WERE PLANNING ON DOING
23 THIS, HAVING THIS MASSIVE OUTREACH; AND THEN WHETHER IT
24 WORKS BEST FROM A PUBLIC POLICY OR PUBLIC PERSPECTIVE TO
25 HAVE A WORKSHOP OR NOT, WE CAN LEAD THAT TO THE RESPECTIVE
0139
01 AGENCY.
02 THAT'S JUST PART OF THE PROCEDURE AND I'D
03 JUST REQUEST THE DESIRES OF THE PANEL BE MADE KNOWN IN
04 THIS LETTER.
05 DR. SEIBER: WELL, WE DISCUSSED THAT A LITTLE BIT.
06 ONE OF THE REASONS TO HAVE A SO-CALLED WORKSHOP IS SO
07 THERE COULD BE AN EXCHANGE OF IDEAS FROM, YOU KNOW,
08 WHOEVER HAS DIFFERENCES OF OPINIONS OR WANTS TO EXPRESS
09 THEM; AND WHETHER IT NEEDS TO BE A FULL-BLOWN WORKSHOP
10 WHERE YOU GET AN AUDITORIUM IN SAN FRANCISCO AND INVITE
11 PEOPLE FROM ALL OVER THE WORLD OR MAYBE THERE'S A BETTER
12 WAY OF ACCOMPLISHING THAT SAME THING, MAYBE A ROOM LIKE
13 THIS WITH A MICROPHONE AND PEOPLE DISCUSSING BACK AND
14 FORTH, I THINK WE -- IF WE HAVE ANY WORKSHOP AT ALL, WE
15 OUGHT TO SCALE IT TO EXACTLY WHAT WE WANT TO ACCOMPLISH
16 AND NOT JUST HAVE ANOTHER BIG AIRING OF THE WHOLE -- ALL

17 OF THE SCIENTIFIC ISSUES.
18 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, I --
19 DR. SEIBER: THAT'S ALREADY BEEN AIRED.
20 DR. GLANTZ: I THINK IF YOU GUYS, AS PART OF THE
21 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR THE S.R.P. DRAFT, WANT TO HAVE A
22 WORKSHOP OR PUBLIC MEETING OR A PUBLIC BRIEFING OR
23 SOMETHING LIKE THAT, AS LONG AS THAT DOESN'T SLOW THINGS
24 DOWN, I THINK THAT'S A GREAT IDEA, YOU KNOW; BUT I THINK
25 THAT THE THING THAT I'M LOOKING TOWARD GETTING FROM THE
0140
01 PUBLIC ARE THE WRITTEN COMMENTS.
02 DR. PITTS: WELL, I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT, YEAH,
03 THE WRITTEN COMMENTS; AND THEN ALSO IT'S IMPORTANT THAT
04 THE PUBLIC BE HEARD IN THIS AND IT DOESN'T NECESSARILY
05 HAVE TO DELAY THE PROCESS. I THINK THAT'S THE POINT. SO
06 WE'LL WORK ON SUCH A WAY THAT WE HAVE A FULL WORKSHOP.
07 DR. GLANTZ: IF THEY DO.
08 DR. PITTS: ALL OF THE INTERESTED PARTIES HAVE ONE
09 LAST SHOT OR COMMENT IN PUBLIC OR IN WRITING TO HAVE THE
10 WRITTEN STATEMENT. HAVE IT SET UP IN A WAY TO NOT DEFER
11 THE OVERALL PROCESS, NOT TO DELAY IT. I THINK THAT COULD
12 BE DONE. DO YOU AGREE WITH THAT? I THINK WE CAN HANDLE
13 IT.
14 MS. DENTON: UH-HUH.
15 DR. GLANTZ: I THINK AT THIS STAGE IF YOU HAD A
16 WORKSHOP, PEOPLE WOULD BE -- SHOULD THEN -- IF THEY WANT
17 THE S.R.P. TO CONSIDER THEIR COMMENTS, THEY SHOULD BE
18 SUBMITTED IN WRITING.
19 MS. DENTON: THERE'S NO QUESTION ON THAT. EVEN IN
20 PART C'S, THEY ALWAYS HAVE TO BE WRITTEN.
21 DR. PITTS: OKAY. THEN IF THERE ARE NO OTHER ITEMS
22 TO BE BROUGHT UP, WE'LL THANK THE PANEL AGAIN AND MOVE TO
23 THE NEXT ITEM ON THE AGENDA, WHICH IS THE PROGRESS REPORT
24 ON E.T.S., INCLUDING EXPOSURE AND HEALTH EFFECTS FOR
25 E.T.S.
0141
01 DR. VANCE: GOOD AFTERNOON. I'M BILL VANCE, THE
02 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF
03 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT.
04 RECENTLY CHAIRMAN PITTS ASKED THAT WE PROVIDE
05 HIM WITH A WRITTEN UPDATE OF THE STATUS OF OUR HEALTH
06 ENVIRONMENT OF THE TOBACCO SMOKE OR E.T.S. A COPY OF OUR
07 OCTOBER 11TH UPDATE WAS PROVIDED TO A.R.B. AND WAS
08 FORWARDED TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE S.R.P.
09 THIS AFTERNOON I WOULD LIKE TO GO OVER THE
10 HIGHLIGHTS OF THAT BRIEFING PAPER, WHICH WILL COVER WHAT
11 WE HAVE DONE, WHERE WE ARE NOW AND WHAT OUR NEXT STEPS ARE
12 TO COMPLETE THE HEALTH ASSESSMENT OF THE E.T.S.
13 OUR ASSESSMENT OF THE E.T.S. BEGAN IN EARLY
14 1992 WHEN WE POSTED A PUBLIC WORKSHOP ON E.T.S. IN LATE
15 1992 TO COLLECT INFORMATION ON THIS IMPORTANT SUBSTANCE.
16 WE RELEASED OUR FIRST TWO DOCUMENTS, "RESPIRATORY HEALTH
17 EFFECTS OF E.T.S." AND "THE ROLE OF E.T.S. IN CANCERS
18 OTHER THAN LUNG CANCER," IN MAY OF 1994 FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
19 AND HELD A PUBLIC WORKSHOP IN JUNE.
20 WE RELEASED OUR THIRD DOCUMENT,
21 "CARDIOVASCULAR HEALTH EFFECTS OF EXPOSURE TO E.T.S.," IN

22 SEPTEMBER OF 1994 FOR A PUBLIC COMMENT AND HELD A PUBLIC
23 WORKSHOP IN OCTOBER.
24 WE RELEASED OUR FOURTH DOCUMENT,
25 "DEVELOPMENTAL AND REPRODUCTIVE EFFECTS OF EXPOSURE TO
0142
01 E.T.S." IN MARCH OF 1995 FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AND HELD A
02 PUBLIC WORKSHOP IN APRIL.
03 WE RELEASED OUR FIFTH DOCUMENT, "E.T.S.
04 EXPOSURE MEASUREMENTS AND PREVALENCE" IN SEPTEMBER OF 1995
05 AND HELD A WORKSHOP IN OCTOBER.
06 WE RELEASED OUR SIXTH AND FINAL DOCUMENT,
07 "CARCINOGENIC EFFECTS OF EXPOSURE TO E.T.S.," AN EXCERPT,
08 "E.T.S. AND LUNG CANCER" IN JANUARY OF THIS YEAR FOR
09 PUBLIC COMMENT AND HELD A WORKSHOP IN MARCH. THIS LAST
10 CHAPTER HAS NOW BEEN INCORPORATED INTO THE CHAPTER IN
11 "ROLE OF E.T.S. IN CANCER," SO NOW WE WILL ONLY HAVE FIVE
12 CHAPTERS WHICH WILL ALL BE RELEASED TOGETHER AS ONE
13 PACKAGE.
14 I WOULD LIKE TO MENTION HERE THAT OUR PUBLIC
15 REVIEW DRAFT ON "REPRODUCTIVE AND DEVELOPMENTAL EFFECTS OF
16 E.T.S." PROVIDED SOME OF THE INFORMATION USED BY OUR
17 SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD'S DEVELOPMENT AND REPRODUCTIVE
18 TOXICANT IDENTIFICATION COMMITTEE DURING ITS MAY 5, 1995
19 MEETING. THEY FOUND THIS A VERY HELPFUL DOCUMENT AND
20 PROVIDED US MANY GOOD COMMENTS WHICH HAVE SINCE BEEN
21 INCORPORATED.
22 AS YOU CAN SEE, THE RELEASE OF OUR INITIAL
23 DOCUMENT -- OUR INITIAL DRAFT DOCUMENT SPANS A RANGE OF
24 TWO YEARS. DURING THAT TIME, AND FOR MOST OF THIS YEAR,
25 THE DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN UNDERGOING REVISION IN RESPONSE TO
0143
01 PUBLIC COMMENTS AND HAVE BEEN UPDATED TO INCORPORATE
02 RECENT STUDIES.
03 WE RECEIVED SOME COMMENTS DURING OUR PUBLIC
04 WORKSHOPS AND MANY MORE BY MAIL DURING THE PUBLIC COMMENT
05 PERIODS. FOR EXAMPLE, WE RECEIVED FOUR LARGE BOXES OF
06 INFORMATION RELATED TO THE LUNG CANCER CHAPTER ALONE.
07 DR. PITTS: THAT'S "BOXES"?
08 DR. VANCE: BOXES, SIR. O.E.H.H.A. STAFF HAVE HAD
09 TO SPEND A GREAT DEAL OF TIME GOING THROUGH THE WRITTEN
10 PUBLIC COMMENTS AND THE INFORMATION PROVIDED BY INTERESTED
11 PARTIES. THIS IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF OUR PROCESS THAT
12 CALLS FOR THE FAIR AND OBJECTIVE ANALYSIS OF SCIENTIFIC
13 INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY INTERESTED PARTIES.
14 OUR REVISIONS AND UPDATES WILL HELP IMPROVE
15 THE QUALITY AND COMPREHENSIVENESS OF THE DOCUMENTS. LET
16 ME GIVE JUST AN EXAMPLE OR TWO.
17 DR. MICHAEL LIPSID (PHONETIC) OF O.E.H.H.A.
18 HAS REPLACED DR. DENNIS SHUSTERMAN (PHONETIC) AS THE
19 PRINCIPAL AUTHOR OF THE RESPIRATORY HEALTH EFFECTS CHAPTER
20 AND DR. LIPSID IS A HIGHLY QUALIFIED PHYSICIAN WITH A
21 STRONG BACKGROUND IN RESPIRATORY DISEASES. DR. LIPSID HAS
22 GREATLY EXPANDED THE SECTION ON THE EXACERBATION AND
23 INDUCTION OF ASTHMA IN CHILDREN BY E.T.S.
24 O.E.H.H.A. HAD RECEIVED PUBLIC COMMENTS THAT
25 ONLY 5 OF 21 STUDIES FOR THIS HEALTH EFFECT SHOWED A
0144

01 STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION. IN FACT,
02 DR. LIPSID FOUND MORE THAN 35 STUDIES, MOST OF WHICH, BUT
03 NOT ALL, SHOW AN ASSOCIATION.
04 DR. LIPSID HAS CONDUCTED A FORMAL
05 META-ANALYSIS ON THESE STUDIES, THE RESULTS OF WHICH
06 STRENGTHENED THE CHARACTERISTIC OF CHILDHOOD E.T.S.
07 EXPOSURE AS A RISK FACTOR FOR AN INDUCTION FOR CHILDHOOD
08 ASTHMA.
09 THE CHAPTER ON EXPOSURE MEASUREMENTS AND
10 PREVALENCE, WHICH WAS COMPLETED IN LATE 1994, ACKNOWLEDGED
11 THAT IT COULD NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE POTENTIAL EFFECTS
12 AND REDUCTION IN EXPOSURE TO E.T.S. FOLLOWING PASSAGE OF
13 ASSEMBLY BILL 13.
14 THIS BANNED -- I'M SORRY. THIS LEGISLATION
15 BANNED SMOKING IN MOST WORKPLACES AFTER JANUARY 1995; THUS
16 OUR JANUARY '95 DRAFT IS A LITTLE DATED FOR EXPOSURES THAT
17 NOW EXIST IN CALIFORNIA WORKPLACES AND MANY CITIES THAT
18 HAVE BANNED SMOKING IN PUBLIC PLACES. AS A CONSEQUENCE,
19 WE ARE TRYING TO DEVELOP A MORE UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION ON
20 E.T.S. EXPOSURES FOR THIS CHAPTER.
21 WHERE ARE WE NOW? THE FIVE CHAPTERS HAVE
22 BEEN OUT FOR INTERNAL REVIEW SINCE EARLY NOVEMBER. THREE
23 OF THE S.R.P. MEMBERS, DR. STAN GLANTZ, CRAIG BUYERS AND
24 DR. FRIEDMAN, HAVE SUBMITTED COMMENTS TO OUR OFFICE AND
25 I'M VERY, VERY APPRECIATIVE OF THOSE COMMENTS. CONTRARY
0145
01 TO HUMAN NATURE, YOU FOLKS SUBMITTED THEM, ONE A MONTH
02 EARLY, SO THAT REALLY DOES HELP US AND I WANT TO THANK YOU
03 VERY MUCH FOR THAT.
04 WE'RE IN THE PROCESS OF INCORPORATING THESE
05 AND OTHER COMMENTS AT THIS TIME.
06 AN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND INTRODUCTION ARE
07 ALSO BEING PREPARED, ALONG WITH THE RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY
08 TO COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE LAST PUBLIC COMMENT
09 PERIOD. I EXPECT WE CAN HAVE ALL OF THIS COMPLETED IN
10 TIME FOR A JANUARY 1997 RELEASE DATE.
11 IT HAS BEEN OUR PRACTICE TO ALLOW 60-DAY
12 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIODS ON OUR HEALTH ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTS;
13 THUS, WE SHOULD KNOW THE EXTENT OF THE NEW PUBLIC COMMENTS
14 BY SPRING, EARLY SPRING. WHILE WE INTEND TO ALLOW FOR
15 FULL PUBLIC COMMENT ON ALL OF THESE DOCUMENTS, WE WOULD
16 ALSO LIKE TO PROVIDE FOR AN EXPEDITED COMPLETION OF THE
17 PROJECT; THEREFORE, WE ANTICIPATE ONLY RESPONDING TO
18 COMMENTS THAT RAISE NEW ISSUES OR NEW INFORMATION NOT
19 PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED.
20 I CAN'T TELL YOU WITH CERTAINTY THE DATE THAT
21 THE S.R.P. WILL -- I'M SORRY -- THAT THE S.R.P. DRAFT WILL
22 BE PRESENTED TO YOU, BUT WE ARE CURRENTLY THINKING IN
23 TERMS OF EARLY SUMMER OF 1997. THIS WILL ALL REALLY BE A
24 FUNCTION OF HOW MANY COMMENTS WE GET ON THE NEW MATERIAL,
25 AND IF IT'S VERY BRIEF, IF THERE AREN'T VERY MANY COMMENTS
0146
01 OR NEW MATERIAL, THEN WE HOPE TO DO THIS MUCH EARLIER THAN
02 JUNE OF NEXT YEAR.
03 OKAY. THIS DOES COMPLETE MY UPDATE OF THE
04 STATUS OF OUR HEALTH STATUS AT E.T.S. THANK YOU.
05 DR. PITTS: THANK YOU. PANEL?

06 DR. GLANTZ: EVERYONE'S LOOKING AT ME.
07 WELL, I -- A COUPLE OF THINGS. I HAVE HAD A
08 CHANCE TO REVIEW, AS DR. VANCE SAID, THE MATERIAL THAT
09 O.E.H.H.A. PUT TOGETHER AND I THOUGHT IT WAS VERY, VERY
10 GOOD AND VERY WELL DONE. I ALSO GOT OR BILL LOCKETT GOT
11 AND ASKED ME TO READ OUT OF THAT, BECAUSE I'VE BEEN MEAN
12 TO HIM OR SOMETHING; BUT I ACTUALLY READ ALL OF THE PUBLIC
13 COMMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED AND I THINK O.E.H.H.A.
14 HAS DONE A GOOD JOB OF INTEGRATING THEM; AND MY ONLY
15 CONCERN I THINK -- WELL, I'M PLEASED TO HEAR THE SCHEDULE
16 HAS BEEN MOVED UP QUITE A LOT FROM WHAT YOU WERE TALKING
17 ABOUT AT OUR LAST MEETING. I'D LIKE TO SEE THE REPORT OUT
18 IN THE FIRST PART OF JANUARY. I THINK IT'S VIRTUALLY
19 THERE AT THIS POINT.
20 THE OTHER THING -- AND THEN THAT WOULD SPEED
21 UP THE REST OF THE PROCESS ACCORDINGLY.
22 THE OTHER ISSUE WHICH HAS BEEN THE SUBJECT OF
23 SOME DISCUSSION SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THIS WHOLE
24 ENTERPRISE IN 1992 IS THE EXTENT TO WHICH O.E.H.H.A.
25 SHOULD HAVE TO PREPARE A FORMAL RESPONSE TO THE COMMENTS;
0147
01 AND I THINK IF YOU GO BACK AND LOOK AT MINUTES, YOU'LL SEE
02 THAT THERE WAS ALWAYS AN UNDERSTANDING THAT THAT WOULD BE
03 HANDLED IN A SUMMARY MANNER RATHER THAN A VERY DETAILED
04 MANNER; AND WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST AGAIN IN THE
05 INTEREST OF EXPEDITING THINGS AND ALSO FACILITATING OUR
06 REVIEW OF THE DOCUMENT WHEN IT GETS HERE IS THAT YOU --
07 WHEN YOU RELEASE THE DOCUMENT, THE S.R.P. DRAFT, FOR YOUR
08 60-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD THAT YOU NOT INCLUDE A
09 POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSE TO THE PUBLIC COMMENTS AT THAT
10 POINT, BUT RATHER WAIT UNTIL YOU'VE GOTTEN WHATEVER PUBLIC
11 COMMENTS YOU GET AND THEN PREPARE A SINGLE RESPONSE.
12 I THINK THAT WILL BE MORE EFFICIENT USE OF
13 YOUR TIME. I KNOW YOU'VE GOT A LOT OF THAT DRAFTED
14 ALREADY; BUT I THINK RATHER THAN PUTTING TIME INTO POLICY,
15 THAT IT WOULD JUST MAKE MORE SENSE TO DO IT ALL AT ONCE OR
16 THREE MONTHS OR SO, WHENEVER THE DOCUMENT CAME TO US. SO
17 I WOULD SUGGEST THAT TO YOU.
18 DR. VANCE: OKAY.
19 DR. SEIBER: NOW, DOES -- LET ME SEE IF I
20 UNDERSTAND. YOU SAID JANUARY 1997 YOU WOULD RELEASE A
21 DRAFT AND THEN THERE WOULD BE A 60-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT, AND
22 THAT'S THE SAME THING?
23 DR. GLANTZ: RIGHT.
24 DR. SEIBER: I'M GETTING MIXED UP ON --
25 DR. GLANTZ: THE ONLY TWO DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WHAT
0148
01 I'M SUGGESTING AND WHAT HE SAID IS I'M SUGGESTING THAT THE
02 THING IS IN A MORE ADVANCED STATE AND I'D LIKE TO SEE IT
03 RELEASED BY THE FIRST OF THE MONTH RATHER THAN THE END OF
04 THE MONTH.
05 AND THE OTHER THING IS THAT I DON'T THINK
06 THEY SHOULD RELEASE A RESPONSE TO THE COMMENTS THEY'VE
07 RECEIVED SO FAR AT THIS POINT. I THINK THEY SHOULD JUST
08 PUT THE DOCUMENT OUT AND LET THE DOCUMENT STAND ON ITS
09 OWN, WHICH I THINK IT WILL DO PRETTY WELL, AND THEN
10 PREPARE A SINGLE RESPONSE TO ALL THE COMMENTS BEFORE THEY

11 DELIVER THE REPORT TO US.
12 DR. SEIBER: OKAY.
13 DR. PITTS: HOW DOES THAT SOUND TO YOU?
14 DR. VANCE: I'LL HAVE TO CHECK INTO THE LEGALITY OF
15 NOT RESPONDING TO PUBLIC COMMENTS.
16 DR. PITTS: WELL, YOU WOULD RESPOND, BUT --
17 DR. VANCE: YES. I DO CONCUR WITH DR. GLANTZ THAT
18 WE WILL NOT BE MAKING POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSES TO PUBLIC
19 COMMENTS. WHAT WE TRY TO DO IS JUST SUMMARIZE WHAT THE
20 COMMENTS WERE AND RESPOND IN KIND; AND WE HAVE -- AS
21 DR. GLANTZ HAS POINTED OUT, WE HAVE MUCH OF THAT PREPARED
22 ALREADY AT THIS POINT, SO I THINK IT WOULDN'T TAKE MUCH
23 ADDITIONAL EFFORT, OTHER THAN THE FORMAT; AND I DON'T
24 THINK WE'RE GOING TO SPEND A GREAT DEAL MORE TIME IN THAT
25 RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY THAN WE ALREADY HAVE. IT WOULD BE
0149
01 MUCH LIKE FORMATTING THE CURRENT CHAPTERS THAT YOU FOLKS
02 HAVE ALREADY REVIEWED.
03 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, WOULD IT BE FAIR TO SAY THAT IF
04 YOUR LAWYERS TELL YOU IT'S OKAY, THE IDEA OF JUST SIMPLY
05 PREPARING ONE RESPONSE TO THE COMMENTS LATER IN THE
06 PROCESS, IS THAT SOMETHING YOU THINK WOULD BE OKAY FROM A
07 SCIENTIFIC POINT OF VIEW, ASSUMING THE LAWYERS DON'T SAY
08 THAT YOU'RE COMPELLED TO DO SOMETHING DIFFERENTLY?
09 DR. VANCE: THAT'S HARD FOR ME TO SAY, DR. GLANTZ,
10 BECAUSE AS AN AUTHOR OF PUBLICATIONS OR PAPERS, I'VE
11 ALWAYS APPRECIATED SEEING THE RESPONSES BACK. AND AS A
12 REVIEWER, IT WAS ALWAYS NICE TO SEE THAT PEOPLE RESPONDED
13 TO THE COMMENTS. SO IF WE KEEP IT TO A MINIMUM, AS YOU
14 HAVE SUGGESTED AS SUMMARIES, I THINK WE'RE THERE.
15 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, OKAY.
16 DR. PITTS: I CAN UNDERSTAND YOUR POSITION. I
17 THINK THAT'S A GOOD POINT, WHY YOU WANT US TO DO THAT.
18 DR. GLANTZ: IF YOU CAN GET ALL THAT DONE BY THE
19 FIRST PART OF JANUARY, THEN YOU WON'T GET ANY POINT OUT OF
20 ME.
21 DR. VANCE: THANK YOU, SIR.
22 DR. FRIEDMAN: I THINK TO SUPPORT THAT IF PEOPLE
23 SEE THERE IS SOME RESPONSE ALREADY, IT MIGHT HEAD OFF
24 REPETITION OF THE SAME THING, BECAUSE THEY DIDN'T -- THE
25 PUBLIC DIDN'T THINK THAT THEY RESPONDED IN THE FIRST PLACE
0150
01 OR DIDN'T PAY ATTENTION TO IT. SO I THINK THAT MIGHT BE
02 MORE EFFICIENT.
03 DR. PITTS: AND IT'S IMPORTANT, AGAIN, THAT WE BE
04 VERY CAREFUL TO BE SURE THAT THE PUBLIC INPUT IS HANDLED
05 PROFESSIONALLY, WHICH OF COURSE WE WOULD DO, BUT ALSO IN A
06 MANNER THAT SEEMS APPROPRIATE TO THE PUBLIC --
07 DR. VANCE: THANK YOU.
08 DR. PITTS: -- BECAUSE THEY HAVE A VITAL CONCERN IN
09 THIS. SO I WOULD APPRECIATE WHAT YOU'RE SAYING; AND WHILE
10 YOU'RE SAYING IT, YOU'VE MOVED THINGS UP SUFFICIENTLY AND
11 I SEE THE PANEL NODDING HEADS AND I WANT TO COMPLIMENT ALL
12 OF YOU, YOURSELF AND THE ENTIRE TEAM, FOR WHAT'S
13 INVOLVED.
14 THIS IS A VERY IMPORTANT PROJECT. IT'S
15 COMPLEX, IT'S CONTROVERSIAL, AND YOU ARE ALL HONORED IN A

16 SENSE, AS IS THE DIESEL, FOR EXAMPLE.
17 IT'S A COMPLEX SITUATION AND I COMPLIMENT YOU
18 ON THIS AND I'M SURE THE PANEL HAS. WE APPRECIATE YOUR
19 COMMENTS AND THE TIME LINE.
20 ARE THERE ANY OTHER REMARKS?
21 DR. GLANTZ: YES. CAN I ASK A QUESTION?
22 WELL, BEFORE, DID ANYBODY ELSE HAVE ANY
23 QUESTIONS ON THIS?
24 DR. PITTS: YES. IF THERE ARE ANY OTHER
25 QUESTIONS --
0151
01 DR. GLANTZ: THIS GETS BACK TO THE PREVIOUS
02 DISCUSSION OF DIESEL. I MEAN, DO YOU THINK IT WOULD BE
03 APPROPRIATE TO USE A 60-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR THE
04 DIESEL?
05 DR. PITTS: HOW WOULD YOU FEEL ABOUT THAT,
06 PROVIDING THEY REALLY HAD A FULL 60 DAYS?
07 DR. VANCE: SIR, I THINK BY LAW THEY WILL HAVE TO
08 HAVE 60 DAYS.
09 DR. PITTS: BUT 60 WOULD BE OKAY? WOULD THAT BE
10 REASONABLE THEN --
11 DR. VANCE: IT'S HARD FOR ME TO --
12 DR. PITTS: -- FOR DIESEL?
13 DR. VANCE: IT'S HARD FOR ME TO RESPOND TO THAT
14 BECAUSE THE DOCUMENT THAT HAS BEEN SENT OUT FOR REVIEW, AS
15 YOU CAN SEE ON DR. FROINES' DESK, IS DOUBLE-SIDED,
16 SINGLE-SPACED.
17 DR. GLANTZ: YEAH, BUT THEY ALL ARE.
18 DR. PITTS: HERE. YOU CAN SEE IT ON MY DESK, TOO
19 (INDICATING).
20 DR. GLANTZ: IT DOESN'T LOOK ANY THICKER THAN
21 USUAL.
22 DR. PITTS: IT WORKS FINE.
23 DR. VANCE: ENVIRONMENTAL TOBACCO SMOKE, I DON'T
24 THINK WAS ANY SHORTER.
25 DR. PITTS: THEY'RE ALL TOUGH. I THINK STAN'S
0152
01 BROUGHT UP A GOOD QUESTION. IF E.T.S. SAYS 60 DAYS, IF WE
02 CAN SAY 60 DAYS WITH THE PROVISION THAT IT'S 60 FULL DAYS
03 FROM THE RECEIPT OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR COMPANY, WHATEVER
04 FROM THEIR RECEIPT, IT'S 60 DAYS.
05 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, YOU DON'T WANT TO DO IT FROM
06 RECEIPT.
07 DR. PITTS: WELL, I MEAN WHEN YOU MAIL IT, AND
08 ALLOW A WEEK FOR THE U.S. MAIL AND SAY "FINE, THAT'S
09 LEGITIMATE." I'VE SEEN THE CASES WHERE THEY'VE ONLY HAD
10 EIGHT DAYS, THREE DAYS.
11 DR. GLANTZ: NO.
12 DR. PITTS: I KNOW THAT'S NOT FAIR.
13 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, THAT'S WHY I SUGGESTED ON THE
14 DIESEL TO SEND OUT A LETTER SAYING WHEN THE THING WOULD BE
15 AVAILABLE SO THEY COULD BE STANDING THERE READY.
16 DR. PITTS: ACTUALLY, I'D LIKE TO GET THAT IN THE
17 RECORD. THAT IS A GOOD IDEA. "IT'S COMING OUT" AND
18 GIVING A PREVIEW OF COMING ATTRACTIONS.
19 DR. VANCE: LET ME TELL YOU THAT WITH MODERN
20 TECHNOLOGY THINGS HAVE ACTUALLY SPEEDED UP A BIT. I'VE --

21 I AM SURE THAT IF WE CAN DO IT MECHANICALLY, WE INTEND TO
22 POST THIS DIESEL DOCUMENT ON THE INTERNET ON OUR HOME PAGE
23 AND IT WILL BE ANNOUNCED, AS DR. GLANTZ IS ASKING, IN THE
24 CALIFORNIA REGULATORY NOTICE REGISTER. IT WILL STATE THE
25 DATE THAT IT WILL BE AVAILABLE ON THE INTERNET. WE WILL
0153
01 ALSO MAKE AVAILABLE HARD COPIES TO THOSE WHO PREFER THAT.
02 DR. PITTS: AND YOU HAVE IT ON THE DECEMBER E.T.S.?
03 DR. VANCE: I BELIEVE THAT WE WILL, YES.
04 DR. GLANTZ: YES.
05 DR. PITTS: THAT'S A REALLY GREAT STEP.
06 DR. VANCE: BECAUSE MANY INTERESTED PARTIES HAVE
07 COMMENTED ON THAT, THAT THEY APPRECIATE THAT SERVICE.
08 DR. PITTS: I CAN SENSE GLANCING AROUND THE PANEL
09 THAT WE WOULD ALSO LIKE TO COMPLIMENT YOU ON THAT. THAT'S
10 A VERY GOOD STEP. THIS IS REALLY MOVING AHEAD ON THE
11 PANEL, MOVING AHEAD IN THE INFORMATION AGE. YOU'RE WITH
12 IT AND WE APPRECIATE THAT.
13 ARE THERE ANY OTHER QUESTIONS?
14 IF NOT, WELL, THANKS VERY MUCH.
15 DR. VANCE: THANK YOU ALL FOR YOUR COMMENTS.
16 DR. PITTS: OKAY. NOW, LET'S SEE. THE
17 NEXT-TO-THE-LAST ITEM IS UPDATE FROM THE AIR RESOURCES
18 BOARD STAFF ON THE TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT PROGRAM, BOTH THE
19 AIR RESOURCES BOARD AND THE O.E.H.H.A. STAFF ON THE
20 OVERALL PROGRAM.
21 SO WHERE ARE WE ON ALL THESE? YOU'VE GIVEN
22 US THE OVERHEADS ON THAT SOMEWHERE?
23 DR. GLANTZ: I THINK IN THAT APROPOS TO THE LAST
24 DISCUSSION, WHEN WE WRITE THE LETTER WE DISCUSSED ABOUT
25 DIESEL, I THINK YOU SHOULD SUGGEST 60 DAYS, APROPOS OF THE
0154
01 PREVIOUS DISCUSSION.
02 DR. PITTS: IS THAT AGREEABLE?
03 DR. ALEXEEFF: I THINK THAT WOULD BE FINE.
04 MS. DENTON: MAYBE I COULD COMMENT AGAIN ON THE
05 COMMENTS. THIS IS PRETTY MUCH AN OPEN SECRET, BUT ONE OF
06 THE CRITICISMS THAT WE GET IS THE FACT THAT WE TOOK AND WE
07 CAN ANTICIPATE TWO-AND-A-HALF TO THREE YEARS TO COMPLETE A
08 DOCUMENT; AND WE'RE TRYING, YOU KNOW, AND WE'RE GIVING A
09 VERY SHORT COMMENT PERIOD.
10 SO I JUST WANT TO MAKE THAT POINT, IN THAT WE
11 NEED TO ALLOW SOME KIND OF, YOU KNOW, FLEXIBILITY IN HOW
12 LONG THAT COMMENT PERIOD SHOULD BE. AS I MENTIONED THE
13 FIRST TIME, WE DID NOT PLAN TO HAVE A SIX-MONTH COMMENT
14 PERIOD AND I WOULD EXPECT THAT THIS TIME LINE WOULD BE
15 TIGHTER, TOO, BECAUSE WE WOULD HAVE A DATE THAT WE EXPECT
16 IT TO BE RELEASED TO YOU.
17 BUT THIS IS A CRITICISM, A COMMENT THAT HAS
18 BEEN MADE BEFORE AND IF WE TRY TO CUT THE PUBLIC COMMENT
19 PERIOD TOO SHORT --
20 DR. PITTS: DO YOU THINK 60 DAYS IS TOO SHORT?
21 MS. DENTON: I THINK THAT THE PANEL COULD EVEN SAY,
22 YOU KNOW, FOR TWO- TO THREE-MONTH COMMENT PERIOD OR
23 SOMETHING. YOU COULD MAKE A RANGE AND KIND OF LEAVE IT
24 UP -- AGAIN, LEAVE IT UP TO THE STAFF OR TO THE VARIOUS
25 DEPARTMENTS.

0155
01 DR. PITTS: SORT OF LIKE A RISK, A RANGE.
02 DR. GLANTZ: I MEAN, I'M NOT GOING TO QUIBBLE ABOUT
03 THAT, BUT THE POINT IS JUST ONE THING. THAT CRITICISM IS
04 ALWAYS MADE AND IT'S REALLY KIND OF NOT FAIR BECAUSE, I
05 MEAN, WHEN I GET A PAPER TO REVIEW FOR A JOURNAL, THE
06 PERSON MAY HAVE SPENT DOING TWO YEARS DOING IT AND IT
07 TAKES ME A DAY OR TWO TO CRITIQUE IT.
08 IT'S AN APPLES-TO-ORANGES COMPARISON, BECAUSE
09 THEY'RE NOT BEING TOLD TO GO OUT AND WRITE A DOCUMENT.
10 THEY'RE CRITIQUING WHAT YOU WROTE AND THEY'RE COMING IN
11 AND SAYING WHAT YOU WROTE, WHETHER IT'S GOOD, BAD OR WHY,
12 AND THAT DOESN'T TAKE NEARLY AS MUCH TIME AS ACTUALLY
13 DOING IT.
14 SO THAT'S -- I MEAN, THAT'S COMPLETELY A KIND
15 OF SPECIOUS CRITICISM, AGAIN, SINCE THEY'LL PROBABLY ALL
16 WAIT UNTIL THE NIGHT BEFORE THE DEADLINE ANYWAYS.
17 MS. DENTON: I THINK WE CERTAINLY WOULDN'T GIVE
18 THEM A TWO-AND-A-HALF- TO THREE-YEAR COMMENT PERIOD FOR
19 SURE.
20 DR. PITTS: OKAY. WE'RE FINE. ALL RIGHT. THE
21 PANEL ALL HAS OVERHEADS OF THIS TOPIC.
22 DR. FROINES: BUT I DON'T AGREE THAT WE SHOULD
23 COMMENT ON -- I THINK IF WE'RE GOING TO GIVE THEM TWO TO
24 THREE MONTHS, THEY'LL TAKE THREE MONTHS. EITHER YOU TELL
25 THEM --
0156
01 DR. PITTS: IT'S GOT TO BE A SPECIFIC TIME. I
02 THINK STAN'S MADE A VERY GOOD POINT. YOU KNOW, REALLY THE
03 PEOPLE WHO REVIEW THAT REALLY NEED IT AT THIS STAGE IN THE
04 GAME ARE THE ACTIVE SCIENTISTS, AND THEY PRESUMABLY ARE UP
05 TO DATE ON THE LITERATURE. THEY KNOW THE GAME AND THEY
06 KNOW THE LITERATURE.
07 THOSE ARE THE KINDS OF RESPONSES YOU WANT.
08 YOU WANT RESPONSES FROM PROS, SCIENTISTS IN THAT
09 PARTICULAR FIELD. SO THEY'RE NOT GOING TO HAVE TO SPEND A
10 GREAT DEAL OF TIME GOING BACK AND REVIEWING THE
11 LITERATURE. IN FACT, YOU'VE CITED THE LITERATURE. THEY
12 CAN MAKE DECISIONS THAT ARE REALLY IN A SHORT PERIOD OF
13 TIME. SO BY THE VERY NATURE OF THE PROCESS OF WHOM YOU
14 WANT TO REVIEW IT, IT SHOULD BE RELATIVELY SHORT, TWO
15 MONTHS.
16 DR. GLANTZ: I THINK WE SHOULD -- AS DR. VANCE SAID,
17 THEY'VE GONE TO A 60-DAY PERIOD. I THINK WE SHOULD
18 SUGGEST THAT.
19 DR. PITTS: TO BE CONSISTENT.
20 DR. GLANTZ: IF SOMEBODY DECIDES TO MAKE IT 62
21 DAYS, WE'RE NOT GOING TO HAVE AN EARTH -- WHATEVER, BUT
22 THE POINT IS IT'S NOT FOREVER.
23 DR. PITTS: OKAY.
24 DR. GLANTZ: WHICH IS THE ORIGINAL --
25 DR. PITTS: ALL RIGHT. LET'S MOVE ON.
0157
01 DR. FLETCHER: MY NAME IS BOB FLETCHER. I'M WITH
02 THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD. I'M WITH THE EMISSIONS
03 ASSESSMENT BRANCH WITHIN THE STATIONARY SOURCE DIVISION,
04 AND WE'RE GOING TO DO A LITTLE TAG-TEAM PRESENTATION FOR

05 YOU TODAY AND JUST GIVE YOU AN OVERVIEW OF WHERE WE'RE AT
06 IN THE RISK MANAGEMENT OF AIR TOXINS, NOT ONLY THE CONTROL
07 PROGRAMS, SOME OF THE OTHER PROGRAMS WE HAVE IN PLACE.
08 JOAN'S GOING TO FOLLOW ME AND GEORGE WILL
09 TALK ABOUT WHAT'S UP WITH SOME OF THE ACTIVITIES RELATED
10 TO SENATE BILL 1731. SO WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO PRETTY
11 MUCH SKIP DOWN AS WELL.
12 IN GENERAL, YOU FOLKS KNOW WELL --
13 DR. FROINES: CAN I STOP YOU, THOUGH? BEFORE YOU
14 START, I JUST WENT THROUGH ALL THE OUTLINE HERE AND I
15 REALLY AM GOING TO BE ANGRY IF SOMEBODY IN THIS DOESN'T
16 TALK ABOUT CHEMICALS THAT ARE GOING TO COME DOWN THE
17 PIPELINE FOR US TO WORK ON.
18 IF NOBODY TALKS ABOUT THAT, THIS IS A WASTE
19 OF EVERYONE'S TIME BECAUSE THE ISSUE IS, WHAT'S BESIDES
20 DIESEL AND LEAD? WHAT IS OUR FUTURE AND WHERE IS IT? AND
21 I WANT THAT TALKED ABOUT, BECAUSE OTHERWISE THIS IS ALL
22 SHOW AND TELL AND I CAN GET IT ALL OFF THE OVERHEADS. I
23 WANT TO KNOW WHAT ARE THE PRIORITIES AND WHERE ARE THEY
24 COMING FROM AND WHEN?
25 MS. DENTON: DR. FROINES, THE LAST SLIDE OF THAT
0158
01 GROUP OF SLIDES IS WHAT WILL ADDRESS WHAT ARE THE MAIN
02 IMPLICATIONS.
03 DR. PITTS: IS THE FUTURE DIRECTIONS?
04 MS. DENTON: THAT'S CORRECT.
05 THE DR. PITTS: COULDN'T WE START THERE AND JUST
06 SAY, WE'VE GOT THE OVERHEADS. WHAT COMPOUNDS ARE
07 ON-LINE? WHAT ARE WE GOING TO BE LOOKING AT? WHERE ARE
08 THESE?
09 THERE MAY HAVE BEEN SOME MISUNDERSTANDING AS
10 TO OUR REQUEST TO THE A.R.B. FOR THIS INFORMATION, BUT I
11 THINK IT'S NOT A MISUNDERSTANDING AMONG OURSELVES. THIS
12 QUESTION KEEPS BEING ASKED. WHAT'S THE NEXT THING?
13 WHAT'S DOWN THE LINE? WHEN'S THE REVIEW OF THE COMPOUNDS
14 COMING?
15 DR. FROINES: IT'S THE SAME OLD STUFF. ALL ABOUT
16 THE PROCEDURES; NOT ABOUT WHAT WE'RE GOING TO DO.
17 DR. PITTS: WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT COMPOUND AND
18 WHERE AND WHAT STATUS ARE YOU WITH -- WHAT'S IN THE ACTUAL
19 TRAIN? WE USED TO GET A LIST OF PRIORITIES. WHERE ARE
20 THEY? WHAT WOULD YOU SAY --
21 DR. FROINES: WHAT ARE THE TEN MOST IMPORTANT
22 COMPOUNDS?
23 DR. PITTS: YEAH. AFTER ALL, THIS DOES SAY
24 DIESEL'S KNOCKED OFF. BEFORE IT KNOCKS US OFF AND E.T.S.
25 IS -- NOW WHAT ARE WE LOOKING INTO, CAUSE IT'S GOING TO
0159
01 TAKE A YEAR OR TWO IN THE OVERALL PROCESS TO COME TO SOME
02 FINAL ANSWER, BUT LET'S SEE THE GAME PLAN. WHERE ARE WE
03 NOW IN THESE ISSUES?
04 MS. DENTON: THE IDENTIFICATION PROCESS, AS THE
05 PANEL HAS KNOWN IT FOR YEARS, AND THE FUTURE
06 IDENTIFICATION HAS CHANGED SOMEWHAT AND SO I WANTED TO
07 SHOW THESE TWO SLIDES.
08 FIRST OF ALL, WHAT HAVE WE ACCOMPLISHED? AS
09 THIS PANEL KNOWS, WE'VE HAD 20 COMPREHENSIVE EXPOSURE

10 HEALTH ASSESSMENTS. WHAT'S HAPPENED?
11 WHAT HAPPENED IN APRIL OF 1993 WAS THAT THE
12 189 H.A.P.'S, THE FEDERAL H.A.P.'S, WERE IDENTIFIED AS
13 TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS, SO NOW WE HAVE A LIST BETWEEN 190
14 AND 200 SUBSTANCES WHICH HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AS TOXIC AIR
15 CONTAMINANTS, AND THE FOCUS OF THE RISK ASSESSMENT WORK
16 NOW IS ON THOSE T.A.C.'S WHICH HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED, WHICH
17 I'LL EXPLAIN IN THE NEXT SLIDE.
18 OKAY. IF I CAN HAVE THE NEXT SLIDE, THE LAST
19 ONE WHICH IS THE FUTURE DIRECTION.
20 SO WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR YOU AS A PANEL AS
21 TO WHAT YOU'LL BE SEEING? WELL, OBVIOUSLY WE'RE TAKING
22 LEAD TO THE BOARD. THAT MEETING IS NOW IN APRIL, BY THE
23 WAY, AND ALSO WE'VE JUST FINISHED TALKING ABOUT DIESEL
24 EXHAUST.
25 WE PUT OUT A REPORT LAST YEAR WHICH WAS THE
0160
01 TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT IDENTIFICATION LIST SUMMARIES, WHICH
02 WAS A THREE- TO FIVE-PAGE SUMMARY EACH -- OF EACH OF THE
03 SUBSTANCES, OVER 240 SUBSTANCES, ON OUR T.A.C. LIST AND WE
04 WILL BE SENDING THE FINAL VERSION OF THAT. WE'LL SEND IT
05 OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS AND WE'LL BE GETTING THE FINAL
06 VERSION OF THAT OUT EARLY NEXT YEAR, BECAUSE WE'RE
07 UPDATING ALL OF THE EXPOSURE INFORMATION AND THE HEALTH
08 INFORMATION IN THOSE SUMMARIES TO REFLECT CURRENT
09 STATE-OF-THE-ART KNOWLEDGE ABOUT CALIFORNIA EXPOSURE AND
10 WHAT'S KNOWN ABOUT THE HEALTH EFFECTS.
11 DR. PITTS: FOR THE -- THERE'S SOMETHING OVER 200
12 COMPOUNDS?
13 MS. DENTON: RIGHT. IT'S CLOSER TO 244.
14 DR. PITTS: OKAY.
15 MS. DENTON: NOW, THAT INFORMATION, WE PLAN TO PUT
16 INTO THE PRIORITIZATION SCHEME WHICH THE PANEL DISCUSSED
17 BASICALLY BETWEEN THE YEARS BETWEEN 1990 AND 1993, WE HAVE
18 A LIST OF NINE DIFFERENT AREAS WHICH WE HAVE HELPED TO
19 EVALUATE AND PRIORITIZE COMPOUNDS; BUT WE'RE PRIORITIZING
20 BOTH THOSE THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AND THOSE THAT HAVE
21 NOT BEEN IDENTIFIED.
22 NOW, WHERE THE WORK IS REALLY PROGRESSING IS
23 IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 1731 GUIDELINES, BECAUSE THOSE
24 ARE THE ONES THAT GEORGE AND HIS GROUP ARE DEVELOPING
25 WHICH WILL HAVE THE HEALTH VALUES FOR WHICH WE CAN MATCH
0161
01 THE EXPOSURE OF THOSE SUBSTANCES, WHICH HAVE BEEN
02 IDENTIFIED AS WELL AS THE INFORMATION THAT WE HAVEN'T
03 IDENTIFIED THAT WE CAN PUT INTO OUR PRIORITIZATION SCHEME,
04 WHICH WILL BE HELPFUL NOT ONLY FOR IDENTIFICATION BUT ALSO
05 FOR CONTROL.
06 FINALLY, A COUPLE OF OTHER THINGS --
07 DR. FROINES: THOSE GUIDELINES --
08 MS. DENTON: -- AND THAT'S WHAT GEORGE IS GOING TO
09 SAY, WHERE THOSE GUIDELINES ARE IN THE DEVELOPMENT, THAT'S
10 WHAT HIS PART IS.
11 THE OTHER TWO THINGS THE PANEL CAN EXPECT TO
12 SEE IS THE REVIEW OF THE NICKEL ASSESSMENT, WHICH WILL
13 PROBABLY BE SOMETIME EARLY NEXT YEAR, A REREVIEW OF THE
14 NICKEL ASSESSMENT. AND ALSO, BILL VANCE JUST TALKED ABOUT

15 E.T.S.
16 SO ESSENTIALLY, INSTEAD OF THE
17 COMPOUND-BY-COMPOUND PROCEDURE THAT THE PANEL HAS BEEN SO
18 HEAVILY INVOLVED WITH BEFORE, MANY OF THE THOSE SUBSTANCES
19 HAVE ALREADY BEEN IDENTIFIED AND WE'RE EVALUATING
20 CALIFORNIA EXPOSURE TO THE H.A.P.'S, WHICH IS REALLY WHERE
21 THE STAFF WORK, THE STAFF RESOURCES, ARE GOING NOW.
22 GEORGE, FOR HIS PART, IS DEVELOPING THE
23 HEALTH VALUES. AND WHEN THOSE ARE DEVELOPED, THEN WE WILL
24 PUT THEM INTO THE WHOLE SCHEME OF OUR PRIORITIZATION
25 SCHEME AND FOR THE CONTROL PROCESS.
0162
01 DR. FROINES: WHEN WILL SOME OF THOSE COMPOUNDS
02 COME BEFORE THIS COMMITTEE? WHAT'S THE DATE?
03 DR. ALEXEEFF: OKAY. IT'S ACTUALLY --
04 DR. GLANTZ: IT'S NOT IN COLOR, GEORGE.
05 DR. ALEXEEFF: RIGHT. IT'S NOT IN COLOR. I'LL
06 PASS AROUND THIS BLUE PIECE OF PAPER. IT'S A LITTLE
07 DIFFERENT, AS JOAN EXPLAINED, FROM OUR PREVIOUS
08 COMPOUND-BY-COMPOUND SUMMARY.
09 SENATE BILL 1731 PASSED AT THE SAME TIME AS
10 THIS BILL A.B. 2728 THAT IDENTIFIED ALL THESE CHEMICALS AS
11 H.A.P.'S. THIS ONE REQUIRES US TO HAVE GUIDELINES ON HOW
12 ONE DOES RISK ASSESSMENTS OF SPECIFIC -- SITE-SPECIFIC
13 RISK ASSESSMENTS.
14 SO WHAT WE HAVE ARE FIVE DOCUMENTS, AND I'LL
15 JUST GO THROUGH THEM BRIEFLY. THE FIRST ONE IS EXPOSURE
16 ASSESSMENT AND STATISTIC ANALYSIS, AND WHAT THAT IS IS THE
17 METHODOLOGY OF HOW ONE ASSESSES THE MODELING AND EXPOSURE,
18 MULTIPATHWAY EXPOSURE.
19 SO IF IT'S EMITTED FROM THE STACK, HOW IT
20 COULD IMPACT WATERWAYS, FOOD, OTHER SORTS OF THINGS. IT
21 TAKES INTO ACCOUNT IMPACTS ON NOT JUST -- IN OUR PREVIOUS
22 T.A.C. DOCUMENTS, WE HAVE A 70-YEAR -- 70-YEAR LIFETIME,
23 70-KILOGRAM PERSON BREATHING 20 MILLIMETERS A DAY.
24 THIS IS GOING TO BE A MUCH MORE EXTENSIVE
25 ANALYSIS OF LOOKING AT BREATHING RATES ACROSS THE WHOLE
0163
01 POPULATION FOR CHILDREN, ADULTS, DIFFERENT ACTIVITIES,
02 THAT KIND OF STUFF. SO THERE'S A LOT OF ADDITIONAL
03 ANALYSIS THAT'S DONE IN THAT. THAT REPORT IS GOING TO
04 BE -- WILL HOPEFULLY BE COMPLETED, READY FOR RELEASE, THIS
05 WEEK IF NOT -- WELL, OUR PLAN IS TO HAVE IT RELEASED THIS
06 WEEK, THIS MONTH.
07 DR. GLANTZ: NOW, WHEN YOU SAY "RELEASED," WHAT
08 DOES THAT MEAN?
09 DR. ALEXEEFF: THAT WILL BE ACTUALLY FOR A PUBLIC
10 COMMENT PERIOD, THE SAME TIME IT WILL GO TO OUR LEADS WHO
11 ARE DR. GLANTZ AND DR. SEIBER; AND WE'LL GET COMMENTS ON
12 THAT.
13 WE'RE REQUIRED BY THE STATUTE TO TAKE THESE
14 TO THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL. SO THE PLAN FOR THAT IS
15 TO GET PUBLIC COMMENTS AND THEN MAKE THE REVISION AND THEN
16 BRING IT TO THE SCIENCE PANEL WITH THAT DOCUMENT.
17 THE NEXT DOCUMENT, "DETERMINATION OF ACUTE
18 TOXICITY EXPOSURE LEVELS," THIS IS -- I RECALL DURING THE
19 FORMALDEHYDE DISCUSSION, DR. PITTS, WHERE YOU'RE REFERRING

20 TO YOUR WIFE AND HER ACUTE EXPOSURE TO FORMALDEHYDE.
21 THERE IS NO GENERALLY ACCEPTED METHODOLOGY FOR ACUTE
22 EXPOSURE, U.S. E.P.A. OR CAL/E.P.A.
23 THIS DOCUMENT DEVELOPS THE METHODOLOGY FOR
24 ACUTE EXPOSURE, PLUS THERE'S ACUTE EXPOSURES FOR A LITTLE
25 OVER 50 COMPOUNDS, OF WHICH FORMALDEHYDE IS ONE; AND THIS
0164
01 COMPOUND ACTUALLY ALREADY WENT OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.
02 WE'VE ALREADY HAD WORKSHOPS. IT TURNS OUT THAT DR. SEIBER
03 AND DR. GLANTZ ARE ALSO THE LEADS ON THAT ONE. THEY'VE
04 ALREADY REVIEWED THE DOCUMENT, GIVEN US INPUT AND GUIDANCE
05 ON THAT ONE.
06 DR. PITTS: EXCUSE ME. THIS ACTUALLY -- THEN,
07 YOU'RE CITING SPECIFIC COMPOUNDS IN THIS?
08 DR. ALEXEEFF: YES. THERE'S 50. THERE'S THE
09 METHODOLOGY --
10 DR. PITTS: AND YOU ACTUALLY HAVE -- HERE'S --
11 DR. ALEXEEFF: SO IT'S 50 COMPOUNDS.
12 DR. PITTS: OKAY.
13 DR. ALEXEEFF: SO INSTEAD OF ONE COMPOUND, WHEN YOU
14 GET THE DOCUMENT, YOU'LL SEE THERE'S 50-SOME COMPOUNDS.
15 NOW, EACH SUMMARY IS SIMILAR -- SIMILAR ALONG THE LINES,
16 AS DR. GLANTZ HAD SUGGESTED YEARS AND YEARS AGO, THAT IF,
17 YOU KNOW -- WE DON'T HAVE TO SPEND A LOT OF TIME IF IT'S
18 FAIRLY STRAIGHTFORWARD SORT OF TRYING TO FIND OUT THAT
19 IT'S TOXIC. LET'S JUST GET TO THE CRUX.
20 SO THESE SUMMARIES ARE FAIRLY LIMITED. EACH
21 ONE IS THREE TO FIVE OR TEN PAGES, BUT IT DEVELOPS THE KEY
22 STUDY, DEVELOPS THE LEVEL.
23 THEN THE -- SO THAT DOCUMENT -- THAT
24 DOCUMENT -- THE PROBLEM IS THESE FIVE DOCUMENTS ARE TIED
25 TOGETHER, SO WE NEED -- WE NEEDED TO WAIT UNTIL THE
0165
01 EXPOSURE ANALYSIS CAUGHT UP BEFORE WE COULD START SENDING
02 THE DOCUMENTS TO YOU, BECAUSE THE FIRST ONE OF THE BIG
03 QUESTIONS WE HAD WHEN WE KICKED THE DOCUMENT OUT WAS HOW
04 IS THIS GOING TO WORK; AND WITHOUT HAVING THE EXPOSURE
05 INFORMATION, IT WAS COMPLICATED. SO WE'VE BEEN WAITING
06 FOR THE OTHER DOCUMENT TO CATCH UP.
07 THE THIRD DOCUMENT --
08 DR. FROINES: I REALLY DO WANT TO CUT IN.
09 DR. ALEXEEFF: YES?
10 DR. FROINES: I ASKED A QUESTION AND I'M GETTING A
11 VERY LONG ANSWER, BUT I'D LIKE THE ANSWER TO THE QUESTION,
12 WHICH IS WHEN WILL THE FIRST COMPOUNDS COME BEFORE THIS
13 COMMITTEE? WILL THEY OCCUR BEFORE THIS COMMITTEE IN
14 1997?
15 DR. ALEXEEFF: OKAY. THE TIMELINESS.
16 DR. FROINES: SHOULD WE JUST GO HOME AND WAIT UNTIL
17 YOU CALL US A FEW YEARS FROM NOW? I MEAN, THIS IS WHAT I
18 MEAN ABOUT PROCEDURAL ISSUES. THAT'S ALL WE SEEM TO TALK
19 ABOUT.
20 WHEN ARE WE GOING TO SEE DOCUMENTS AND WHEN
21 WILL WE REVIEW THEM TO DETERMINE THEIR ADEQUACY? THAT'S
22 WHAT I WANT TO KNOW. I WANT A BOTTOM LINE. I DON'T WANT
23 TO SPEND THE WHOLE TIME ON PROCEDURE.
24 DR. ALEXEEFF: WELL, WE THOUGHT WE'D BE ABLE TO GET

25 THIS TO YOU BEFORE SUMMER.
0166
01 DR. PITTS: BEFORE WHEN?
02 DR. ALEXEEFF: AT LEAST THE FIRST ONE.
03 DR. SEIBER: BEFORE SUMMER.
04 DR. PITTS: THE FIRST CHEMICALS?
05 DR. ALEXEEFF: PROBABLY THE FIRST TWO. I THINK
06 WE'RE SHOOTING FOR IN JULY WITH THE FIRST TWO DOCUMENTS.
07 SO ONE IS THE WHOLE EXPOSURE ANALYSIS AND THE OTHER IS THE
08 ACUTE DOCUMENT.
09 DR. PITTS: BUT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT SPECIFIC
10 COMPOUNDS.
11 DR. FROINES: NO. HE'S GOING TO INCLUDE CHEMICALS
12 WITHIN THE DOCUMENTS, AREN'T YOU?
13 DR. ALEXEEFF: YEAH.
14 DR. FROINES: THAT'S WHAT HE SAID.
15 DR. ALEXEEFF: I THINK HE JUST WANTS TO KNOW WHEN
16 HE'S GOING TO SEE IT.
17 DR. FROINES: I WANT TO KNOW WHY WE GO TO ACUTE
18 TOXICITY LEVELS FIRST. BUT THAT'S PROBABLY THE EASIER ONE
19 FOR THEM, BUT THAT MEANS THERE WILL BE A NUMBER OF
20 COMPOUNDS IN THAT NUMBER TWO DOCUMENT.
21 DR. PITTS: BUT WILL THERE BE ANY SENSE OF
22 PRIORITIZATION? ANY JUDGMENT AS TO WHICH OF THESE
23 REPRESENT MAXIMUM THREATS TO POP- -- PUBLIC HEALTH OF
24 CALIFORNIA? CHILDREN? AVERAGE POPULATION? ET CETERA?
25 WILL THERE BE SOME PRIORITIZATION, SOME INDICATION OF
0167
01 "HERE'S YOUR LIST OF 54"?
02 WHEN DO YOU AND WHEN DO WE SEE THE SCIENTIFIC
03 BASIS FOR PUTTING THIS ON A PRIORITY LIST? IN OTHER
04 WORDS, THAT'S ANOTHER WAY OF SAYING --
05 DR. FROINES: THIS ISN'T A PRIORITY LIST. THIS IS
06 A FINAL REVIEW.
07 DR. ALEXEEFF: YEAH. THESE DOCUMENTS ARE ALREADY
08 FINAL TOXICITY CONTAMINANTS.
09 DR. PITTS: I UNDERSTAND. I DO UNDERSTAND THERE
10 ARE NO CHEMICALS UNDER REVIEW UNDER THE OFFICIAL A.B. 1807
11 PROCESS. IN OTHER WORDS, IS THAT BASICALLY TRUE? TO GET
12 TO THE BOTTOM LINE, WE'RE NOT LOOKING AT IT?
13 DR. SEIBER: THAT CAN'T BE TRUE BECAUSE WE HEARD
14 FROM THE D.P.R. PEOPLE THAT THEY WERE GOING TO BRING US
15 TWO OR THREE CHEMICALS.
16 DR. FROINES: YEAH. BUT TAKING THEM ASIDE, THE
17 A.R.B., IS THERE A SINGLE CHEMICAL BEING WORKED ON RIGHT
18 NOW BESIDES LEAD AND DIESEL?
19 MS. DENTON: THOSE ARE THE ONLY TWO THAT ARE IN THE
20 PROCESS, THE FORMAL IDENTIFICATION PROCESS THAT HAVE NOT
21 BEEN IDENTIFIED YET. JUST DIESEL AND LEAD.
22 DR. PITTS: THERE'S NOTHING EVEN IN -- ESSENTIALLY,
23 WE'RE COMPLETING THOSE.
24 SO THERE'S NOTHING ON THE LIST OF 1807
25 COMPOUNDS THAT'S FORMALLY IN THE PROCESS WHICH TAKES AT
0168
01 LEAST A YEAR OR TWO TO COMPLETE?
02 MS. DENTON: BOB REMINDS ME WE HAVE NICKEL AS WELL.
03 DR. PITTS: WELL, THAT'S REVISITING.

04 DR. FROINES: THAT DIDN'T COUNT.
05 DR. PITTS: I THINK THAT HAS MAJOR IMPLICATIONS
06 JUST AS FAR AS I CAN SEE FOR WHAT THE PANEL WILL BE
07 DOING. I MEAN, WHY ARE WE -- WE'RE LOOKING AT PROCEDURES.
08 DR. FROINES: THE PANEL'S SAYING WE WANT TO MEET
09 EVERY TWO MONTHS. YOU'RE SAYING, WELL, WE'LL GET TO YOU
10 IN THE SECOND 21ST CENTURY.
11 DR. PITTS: IT'S JUST -- WE'RE NOT TRYING TO BE
12 FLIPPANT OR ANYTHING, BUT I THINK THERE ARE THINGS THAT
13 OUGHT TO BE GOING THROUGH THIS PROCESS. I CAN THINK OF
14 SEVERAL VERY IMPORTANT THINGS THAT SHOULD BE GOING THROUGH
15 THIS PROCESS RIGHT NOW. IT'S GOING TO TAKE TWO YEARS TO
16 GET THEM OUT. EVEN IF WE SAY, START THEM TOMORROW, OKAY,
17 LET'S DECIDE WHAT THEY ARE.
18 WHAT YOU THINK THEY ARE IS NOT NECESSARILY
19 WHAT THE PANEL THINKS THEY ARE, BUT THE STATUS OF -- THE
20 A.R.B. IS CHARGED WITH A PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY FOR
21 PROTECTING PUBLIC HEALTH.
22 DR. SEIBER: NOW I'M GETTING CONCERNED.
23 DR. PITTS: SLOW ME DOWN. I'M CONFUSED. I WANT
24 TO --
25 DR. SEIBER: THE CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS BROUGHT
0169
01 US 189 CHEMICALS AND WE PASSED A LAW IN CALIFORNIA AND
02 SAID, "OKAY. WE'RE GOING TO MAKE THEM ALL AND BRING THEM
03 ALL IN." THEY'RE ALREADY DECLARED, BUT EACH ONE OF
04 THEM -- SOME OF THEM HAVE TO HAVE RISK ASSESSMENTS DONE.
05 DR. FROINES: ALL OF THEM.
06 DR. SEIBER: WELL, THE ONES THAT WE PRIORITIZE NEED
07 TO BE DONE. SOME OF THEM AREN'T EVEN IN USE ANYMORE.
08 THIS IS WHERE I'M GETTING CONFUSED. I'M ASSUMING WE'RE
09 GOING TO DO AT SOME POINT RISK ASSESSMENTS ON THE
10 INDIVIDUAL CHEMICALS.
11 DR. FROINES: THAT'S THAT (INDICATING). THAT IS
12 WHAT HE'S TELLING YOU HE'S DOING. WHAT YOU SEE UP THERE
13 IS EXACTLY WHAT YOU SAID. IT'S THEIR ANSWER TO THE
14 1990 -- THE STATE ANSWER TO THE 1990 LIMITS.
15 GEORGE IS SAYING HE'S GOING TO BRING THEM.
16 THOSE ARE CATEGORIZED ACUTE, CHRONIC, CANCER AND THEN
17 THEY'RE GOING TO BE BRINGING A CERTAIN NUMBER OF CHEMICALS
18 UNDER EACH CATEGORY OF REPRESENTING THE RISK ASSESSMENT
19 FOR THE H.A.P.'S. THAT'S THE WHOLE POINT OF THIS.
20 DR. SEIBER: WELL, THAT'S GOING TO TAKE A LOT OF
21 TIME. WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO TEAR IT BACK APART AND LOOK
22 AT CHEMICAL A, B, C AND -- AND --
23 DR. PITTS: YOU GOT IT.
24 DR. SEIBER: -- SOME OF THEM WE MIGHT WANT TO
25 CHANGE.
0170
01 DR. PITTS: THAT'S WHAT JOHN IS TRYING TO GET AT.
02 YOU'RE THE CLEANUP BATTER NOW.
03 DR. SEIBER: I'M THE UNINFORMED BATTER RIGHT NOW.
04 DR. PITTS: I'M JUST KIND OF STUCK BECAUSE I SIT
05 HERE AND I CAN THINK OF A NUMBER OF THOSE H.A.P.'S THAT
06 ARE VERY SERIOUS ISSUES TODAY AND I DON'T LIKE TO SEE THEM
07 PUSHED BACK. WHY CAN'T SOME OF THIS BE CONCURRENT, IN
08 FACT? WHY DOES IT HAVE TO BE SEQUENTIAL? WE KNOW THESE

09 ARE REALLY BAD.
10 DR. SEIBER: LET'S TAKE A QUICK EXAMPLE. METHYL
11 TERBUTYL ETHER. HAVE WE DONE A RISK ASSESSMENT ON THAT?
12 MS. DENTON: THAT IS A H.A.P.
13 DR. SEIBER: BUT I MEAN, HAVE WE DONE A RISK
14 ASSESSMENT? EVERYBODY'S OUT BREATHING IT ALL THE TIME.
15 DR. PITTS: BUT WE'RE DRINKING IT, TOO. I MEAN,
16 IT'S IN THE WELLS.
17 DR. ALEXEEFF: FOR METHYL TERBUTYL ETHER, IT IS IN
18 THE NEXT DOCUMENT, THE CHRONIC DOCUMENT FOR NONCANCER
19 REFERENCE LEVELS AND IT'S EVENTUALLY USING THE U.S. E.P.A.
20 REFERENCE DATA; AND IN THE NEXT DOCUMENT, THERE'S 120
21 CHEMICALS. SO THAT ONE INCLUDES METHYL TERBUTYL ETHER.
22 AND AGAIN, THERE'S THE METHODOLOGY FOR CHRONIC -- WE'VE
23 GOT A FEW NONCANCEROUS ON THE CHRONIC LIST.
24 OBVIOUS LEAD, THAT'S A SPECIAL CASE. THERE'S
25 NOTHING SIMILAR TO THAT, BUT I THOUGHT OF PURE
0171
01 FORMALDEHYDE. WE'VE GOT A FEW OF THOSE REFERENCE LEVELS.
02 DR. PITTS: HOW ABOUT METHYL BROMIDE?
03 DR. ALEXEEFF: METHYL BROMIDE? AS IT TURNS OUT,
04 METHYL BROMIDE IS ALSO ON THE ACUTE LIST AND IT'S ALSO ON
05 THE CHRONIC LIST.
06 MS. DENTON: AND IT'S A H.A.P.
07 DR. PITTS: AND IT'S NUMERO UNO ON THE D.P.R. LIST.
08 IF IT WERE ON THE LISTS, IT WOULD BE NUMBER ONE.
09 DR. ALEXEEFF: SO THE PANEL WILL SEE METHYL BROMIDE
10 THROUGH THESE TWO DOCUMENTS HERE.
11 DR. PITTS: WHAT IS THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPING FOR
12 THE D.P.R. WHEN WE'VE EXHAUSTED THESE? WHAT WE'VE DONE
13 FOR BENZENE AND WHAT IS IT -- METHYL BROMIDE OR WHATEVER?
14 M.T.B.E. BUTYLATE IS REALLY A CONCERN AND
15 IT'S NOT -- I DON'T KNOW HOW MUCH REASON WE NEED TO BE
16 CONCERNED, BUT IT'S A CONCERN AND IT'S OUT THERE AND WHY
17 ISN'T THAT IN A LIST RIGHT NOW? WHY ISN'T THAT -- I GUESS
18 WHAT WE'RE SAYING --
19 DR. ALEXEEFF: IT IS IN A LIST.
20 DR. PITTS: WHAT FORMAL STEPS ARE BEING MADE TO
21 MAKE IT A RISK ASSESSMENT PRODUCT?
22 DR. FROINES: BUT, GEORGE, YOU ALSO HAVE IT UNDER
23 NONCANCEROUS REFERENCE EXPOSURE LEVELS AND IT SEEMS TO ME
24 THAT ONE OF THE KEY ISSUES HAS TO DO WITH THE MALTONIAN
25 EXPERIMENTS FOR LEUKEMIA.
0172
01 DR. ALEXEEFF: YES. ONE THING IN THESE DOCUMENTS
02 THAT DOES NOT ADDRESS YOUR QUESTION OR THE 1807 PROCESS IS
03 THAT IN ORDER TO GET ONTO THE H.A.P.'S LIST, IT HAS TO BE
04 TOXIC FOR SOME REASON. SO WHAT WE'RE PRIMARILY DOING IS
05 DEVELOPING THE HEALTH LEVEL BECAUSE OF WHY IT'S ON THE
06 H.A.P.'S LIST, WHY IT WAS CONSIDERED TOXIC ENOUGH TO BE
07 PUT ON THE H.A.P.'S LIST.
08 IF NOW WE THINK IT'S CARCINOGENIC, BUT THAT'S
09 NOT THE BASIS FOR THE H.A.P.'S LIST, THEN IT WOULD REQUIRE
10 US TO GO THROUGH A SEPARATE I.D. OR THE INFORMATION AS TO
11 WHY IT'S A CARCINOGEN. IT IS NOT READILY APPARENT, SO WE
12 HAVEN'T DEVELOPED -- WE HAVEN'T TAKEN M.T.B.E. AND PUT
13 THAT IN A SEPARATE PROCESS, WHICH WE PROBABLY WOULD HAVE

14 TO DO FOR -- I DON'T KNOW. WOULD WE HAVE TO DO THAT FOR
15 THE -- I THINK WE'D HAVE TO AT LEAST HAVE A FULL
16 EXPLANATION ABOUT ITS CARCINOGENICITY, WHICH WE HAVEN'T
17 DONE.
18 MS. DENTON: AND I KNOW THAT U.S. E.P.A. IS, AS WE
19 SPEAK, REEVALUATING THE MALTONIAN SLIDES, SO IT'S STILL IN
20 THE SOMEWHAT DRAFT STAGE AS FAR AS DEVELOPING A POTENCY
21 OUT OF M.T.B.E. I MEAN, THIS IS STATE OF THE ART RIGHT
22 NOW.
23 DR. PITTS: I'M CHUCKLING BECAUSE I REMEMBER
24 STARTING THE DIESEL STUDY IN 1989 WHEN IT'S SITTING BACK
25 THERE. BUT YEAH, WELL, I -- AM I SENSING SOME SENSE OF
0173
01 NOT CONFUSION, BUT BEWILDERMENT?
02 DR. SEIBER: I'M A LITTLE CONFUSED. MAYBE WE CAN
03 HELP PICK OUT A FEW OF THESE.
04 DR. PITTS: YOU WANT SOME HELP PICKING THEM OUT?
05 DR. FRIEDMAN: I'M CONFUSED BECAUSE ON THE ONE HAND
06 I'M HEARING THEM SAY THAT WE'RE GOING TO BE LOOKING AT 50
07 COMPOUNDS FOR ACUTE TOXICITY AND 120 FOR CHRONIC TOXICITY
08 AND YOU GUYS ARE SAYING WE HAVE NOTHING TO DO IN THE NEAR
09 FUTURE. THERE'S SOMETHING THAT DOESN'T --
10 DR. PITTS: OUR MANDATED 1807 RESPONSIBILITY IS TO
11 PRODUCE SCIENTIFIC RISK ASSESSMENTS ON TOXIC AIR
12 CONTAMINANTS AND IF THERE ARE INDIVIDUAL CONTAMINANTS LIKE
13 M.T.B.E., THAT'S ONE OF THEM.
14 DR. FRIEDMAN: BUT I THOUGHT THE PROCESS IS CHANGED
15 TO S.B. 1731?
16 DR. FROINES: NO. THE PROCESS HASN'T BEEN CHANGED
17 BECAUSE THERE ARE STILL TWO LEVELS, ONE OF WHICH IS THE
18 H.A.P.'S ISSUE. AND SECONDLY, THERE ARE OTHER COMPOUNDS
19 THAT ARE NOT ON THAT 189. A LOT OF THE COMPOUNDS ON THAT
20 189 AREN'T WORTH THE PAPER THEY'RE PRINTED ON. THEY'RE
21 LOUSY COMPOUNDS.
22 DR. SEIBER: THAT'S ARBITRARY.
23 DR. PITTS: THAT'S VERY ARBITRARY.
24 DR. FROINES: BUT THERE'S A LOT OF COMPOUNDS THAT
25 DESERVE -- NITROAERINS BEING A CLASSIC EXAMPLE. SO WE
0174
01 HAVE A PROBLEM IF THEY TOOK UP NITROAERINS, THEY COULD BE
02 GOING THROUGH A TRADITIONAL 1807 PROCESS.
03 NOTHING PREVENTS THEM FROM DOING A RISK
04 ASSESSMENTS FOR NITROAERINS. THAT COULD BE THROUGH THE
05 PRIORITY THAT COULD BE DOING THE PROCESS. THEY ALSO HAVE
06 TO DO THIS.
07 AND MY CRITICISM, OR CONCERN, RATHER, IS THAT
08 TO THE DEGREE THAT THIS IS A SLOW, TEDIOUS PROCESS, WE'RE
09 TALKING ABOUT 1998 AND I SUSPECT THAT GEORGE HAS THE ACUTE
10 ONES. HE SAYS, "WE'LL GET IT TO YOU IN JUNE." BUT WHEN
11 DO WE GET THE REST? SO THE POINT IS IF WE WANT WORK,
12 WHICH I THINK WE DO, THIS PROCESS DOESN'T WORK.
13 DR. ALEXEEFF: WELL, OUR PLAN IS TO GET ALL THESE
14 DOCUMENTS TO YOU NEXT CALENDAR YEAR.
15 DR. FROINES: THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO GET FROM
16 YOU.
17 DR. ALEXEEFF: OUR GOAL IS TO BRING ALL FIVE TO YOU
18 BY THE NEXT CALENDAR YEAR, BUT TWO OF THEM BY JUNE OR

19 JULY.
20 DR. PITTS: MY CONFUSION IS WE HAVE 54 CHEMICALS ON
21 THIS. WE HAVE AN 1807 THAT SAYS SCIENTIFIC RISK
22 ASSESSMENT. AREN'T WE SUPPOSED TO -- ARE WE NOT GOING TO
23 DO RISK ASSESSMENTS ON ANY OF THOSE 54 PER THE 1807
24 PROCESS?
25 DR. FROINES: THERE GOES HIS RISK ASSESSMENT.
0175
01 DR. PITTS: WE HAVE. MAYBE REGULATORS DON'T NEED
02 IT.
03 DR. ALEXEEFF: WE HAVE A LONG LIST OF CHEMICALS
04 WHICH HAVE BEEN DECLARED TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS TO WHICH
05 THERE IS NO HEALTH RISK ASSOCIATED WITH THEM. SO WHAT
06 THREE OF THESE DOCUMENTS ARE DOING IS IDENTIFYING THE
07 HEALTH LEVELS FOR THINGS THAT ARE ALREADY THOUGHT TO BE
08 TOXIC CONTAMINANTS.
09 DR. PITTS: WHAT ABOUT THE EXPOSURE LEVEL? DID YOU
10 HAVE AN EQUAL LIST OF 54 EXPOSURE PART A DOCUMENTS?
11 MS. DENTON: DR. PITTS, THAT'S PER MY EARLIER
12 SLIDE. WE -- AS SOON AS WE GET THESE HEALTH VALUES, THEN
13 WE'LL MATCH THEM UP WITH THE EXPOSURE NUMBERS TO SEE WHAT
14 KIND OF RISKS THERE ARE IN CALIFORNIA; BUT WE NEED THE
15 HEALTH VALUES. SO THAT'S WHAT WE SEE AS THE NEXT STEP.
16 THAT IS TO GET THAT INFORMATION.
17 DR. FROINES: I'VE BEEN THROUGH, YOU KNOW, ALL
18 THOSE DOCUMENTS FOR MY OWN PURPOSES, SO I WENT THROUGH
19 EVERY ONE AND I KNOW FROM HAVING GONE THROUGH THEM HOW
20 MUCH ACTUAL MONITORING DATA YOU HAVE AND HOW MUCH YOU'VE
21 RELIED ON FROM U.S. E.P.A., HAVING DONE SOME MONITORING
22 DATA AND OTHER PLACES; AND BASICALLY WHAT YOU HAD WAS
23 VIRTUALLY NONEXISTANT FOR THOSE COMPOUNDS.
24 SO DOES THIS MEAN THAT YOU ARE -- YOU HAVE
25 ESTABLISHED MONITORING PROGRAMS THAT ARE CURRENTLY GOING
0176
01 ON RIGHT NOW OR THAT YOU HAVE TO START THEM ONCE YOU SEE
02 GEORGE'S NUMBERS?
03 MS. DENTON: WE HAVE -- WHAT WE HAVE IS 50 TO 75
04 SUBSTANCES THAT WE'RE CURRENTLY MONITORING FOR, AND WE DO
05 NOT HAVE -- WE DO NOT HAVE SEPARATE MONITORING PROGRAMS TO
06 ADDRESS THE REMAINING.
07 WE PLAN TO LOOK AT THE NUMBERS ONCE HE HAS
08 THEM; BUT IF YOU WANT TO SEE, REMEMBER WE HAVE THESE EIGHT
09 PARTS OF OUR PRIORITIZATION SCHEME WHICH INCLUDE
10 EMISSIONS, WHICH INCLUDE A.B. 1828, A LOT OF DIFFERENT
11 AREAS OTHER THAN MONITORING, THAT WE PLAN TO PUT INTO THAT
12 INFORMATION AFTER THE HEALTH VALUES ARE BACK INTO THAT
13 PRIORITIZATION SCHEME AND THAT WILL KIND OF GIVE US AN
14 IDEA OF WHAT THE HEAVY HITTERS ARE INSTEAD OF EN MASSE
15 MONITORING FOR ANOTHER 150 SUBSTANCES.
16 DOES THAT ANSWER YOUR QUESTION, DR. FROINES?
17 THERE'S A LOT OF OTHER THINGS OTHER THAN MONITORING DATA
18 WHICH WE USE TO EVALUATE THE POTENTIAL RISK.
19 DR. FROINES: BUT I'M ASSUMING THAT THERE ARE --
20 HOW MANY ARE YOU MONITORING RIGHT NOW?
21 MS. DENTON: BETWEEN -- WHAT IS IT? 50?
22 DR. FLETCHER: IT'S PROBABLY A LITTLE BIT MORE THAN
23 50.

24 DR. FROINES: SO WE WILL SEE AT LEAST 50 CHEMICALS
25 TO REVIEW THIS CALENDAR YEAR?
0177
01 MS. DENTON: WELL, THIS IS ON A DIFFERENT TRACK.
02 GEORGE'S REASON FOR DOING SUBSTANCES HE'S TALKING ABOUT IS
03 NOT BASED ON WHAT WE HAD MONITORING DATA FOR.
04 DR. SEIBER: SO WE'RE GOING TO GET THE HEALTH PART
05 FIRST AND THEN THE MONITORING DATA LATER? BECAUSE IT
06 TAKES TIME TO GET SOME REASONABLE MONITORING DATA.
07 DR. ALEXEEFF: UH-HUH. WELL, WHAT WE -- IN
08 DETERMINING THE CHEMICALS TO LOOK AT HEALTH LEVELS FOR,
09 SOME OF THEM ARE -- FOR HEALTH LEVELS, WE HAD PRELIMINARY
10 HEALTH LEVELS ON THE PORTIONS.
11 WE HAD U.S. E.P.A., AND ALL THE NEW ONES WE
12 DID BASED ON EMISSIONS INFORMATION THAT EXISTED EITHER
13 THROUGH THE HOT SPOTS PROGRAM OR T.R.I. AND SO WE DIDN'T
14 HAVE THE MONITORING DATA, BUT WE KNOW THEY'RE EMITTED IN
15 LARGE QUANTITIES SO WE KNOW THE EXPOSURE IS THERE, BUT WE
16 DON'T KNOW THE PRECISES.
17 IN SOME OF THE CASES, WE KNOW THE EXPOSURES
18 BASED ON HOT SPOT LOCATIONS, BUT WE DON'T HAVE A
19 BACKGROUND LEVEL FOR THE WHOLE STATE FOR MANY OF THESE;
20 BUT WE KNOW THAT THESE ARE SUBSTANCES THAT WE'VE CHOSEN
21 WHICH ARE ISSUES IN THE STATE.
22 DR. PITTS: I THINK PROBABLY WHEN YOU MADE UP YOUR
23 LIST OF COMPOUNDS TO BE MONITORING, YOU HAD SOME AT LEAST
24 ROUGH AND READY LIST OF THE POTENTIAL TOXICITY AND
25 POTENTIAL IMPORTANCE TO THE PEOPLE IN CALIFORNIA.
0178
01 DR. ALEXEEFF: UH-HUH.
02 DR. PITTS: IN OTHER WORDS, THEY'RE NOT AS SEPARATE
03 AS THEY MIGHT SOUND AS TWO OPERATIONS. YOU BASED YOUR
04 LIST ON WHICH YOU'RE MONITORING ON SOME -- SOME CONCERN IN
05 PUBLIC HEALTH, EITHER THE INHERENT TOXICITY OR THE AMOUNTS
06 OR A COMBINATION OF BOTH.
07 MS. DENTON: WE WANTED TO ADDRESS DR. SEIBER'S
08 QUESTION. WITH THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE 189 H.A.P.'S,
09 THAT ENDED THE IDENTIFICATION PROCESS.
10 SO WHAT WE'RE IN THE PROCESS OF DOING NOW ARE
11 GETTING THESE HEALTH VALUES. ONCE WE GET THE HEALTH
12 VALUES THAT HAVE ALREADY BEEN IDENTIFIED, WE'LL
13 REPRIORITIZE THEM WHICH WILL BE HELPFUL TO EVALUATE THE
14 POTENTIAL CONTROLS.
15 DR. SEIBER: BUT YOU DIDN'T END IT THERE. THERE
16 MAY BE A CHEMICAL THAT'S NOT ON THE 189 THAT MAYBE HADN'T
17 BEEN MADE YET.
18 MS. DENTON: YEAH. I MEANT IDENTIFIED. IT ENDED
19 THE IDENTIFICATION PROCESS FOR THOSE COMPOUNDS. THEY ARE
20 NOW ON THE LIST AS IDENTIFIED.
21 DR. FROINES: CAN I -- ONE THING I'M NOT CLEAR ON,
22 THE 1990 AMENDMENTS SAY THAT FOR THE TOXIC AIR
23 CONTAMINANTS THAT THEY WILL PROCEED TO DEVELOP TO USE THE
24 BEST AVAILABLE TECHNOLOGY AND THERE'S A LONG DISCUSSION
25 ABOUT WHAT THAT TECHNOLOGY IS AND SHOULD BE, AND THEN THEY
0179
01 TALK ABOUT THAT THE RISK ASSESSMENT PROCESS WILL BE TO
02 DEAL WITH RESIDUAL RISKS SOME YEARS DOWN THE ROAD.

03 DOES THAT MEAN THAT THE PROCESS OF CONTROLLED
04 TECHNOLOGY IMPLEMENTATION IN CALIFORNIA FOR H.A.P.'S IS
05 ONGOING AS WE SPEAK IN CONTRAST TO WHAT WE'RE TALKING
06 ABOUT DOING HERE? BECAUSE THIS REALLY IS NOT PART OF THE
07 1990 ACT.
08 THIS IS A CALIFORNIA PROCESS, BUT THE 1990
09 ACT AMENDMENT IS VERY SPECIFIC ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE
10 CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES THAT ARE REQUIRED AND IT'S ONLY WHEN
11 WE GET INTO RESIDUAL RISK THAT WE ACTUALLY HAVE TO DEAL
12 WITH RISK ASSESSMENT UNDER THE FEDERAL ACT.
13 DR. FLETCHER: WELL, YOU'RE CORRECT THAT WITH THE
14 AMENDMENT THERE HAVE BEEN, I THINK, 22 FEDERAL STANDARDS
15 THAT HAVE BEEN ISSUED FROM DRY CLEANERS TO REFINERIES AND
16 SO THAT IS UNDERGOING RIGHT NOW IN CALIFORNIA.
17 WE'RE TRYING TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO INTEGRATE
18 THEM AND HOW TO IMPLEMENT THEM AND ENFORCE THEM IN THE
19 LAW. STATE LAW ALSO SAYS WE HAVE TO IMPLEMENT AND ENFORCE
20 THOSE FEDERAL STANDARDS.
21 IN EFFECT, THEY'VE BEEN A.T.C.M.'S WHERE WE
22 DON'T HAVE CONTROL MEASURES, SO THEY ARE DEFINITELY SOURCE
23 CATEGORIES THAT ARE BEING CONTROLLED FROM A RISK
24 MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT AND THAT WILL VARY, I THINK, FROM --
25 I THINK THEY HAVE A TOTAL OF 150 STANDARDS THAT THEY
0180
01 INTEND TO ADOPT FROM 100 DIFFERENT SOURCE CATEGORIES OVER
02 THE NEXT TOTAL FROM 1993 TO THE YEAR 2000.
03 RESIDUAL RISK KICKS IN EIGHT YEARS AFTER THE
04 ADOPTION OF THE FEDERAL N.I.O.S.H. AND THAT'S BASED ON
05 ESSENTIALLY ANY SOURCE CATEGORY THAT HAS A POTENTIAL TO
06 POSE A RISK GREATER THAN ONE PER MILLION, BUT IT DOESN'T
07 MEAN THAT YOU'RE GOING TO CONTROL THEM TO A LEVEL OF ONE
08 IN A MILLION.
09 ALL THE ONE IN A MILLION DOES IS TRIGGER A
10 REEVALUATION AND E.P.A. IS IN THE SAME POSITION AS WE ARE,
11 IN THAT THEY NEED HEALTH EFFECTS VALUES IN ORDER TO DO
12 THAT. SO THEY'RE STRUGGLING TRYING TO FIGURE OUT HOW
13 THEY'RE GOING TO IMPLEMENT THE RESIDUAL RISK PROGRAM.
14 IN FACT, I THINK IN NOVEMBER OF '96 THEY'RE
15 SUPPOSED TO HAVE A REPORT TO CONGRESS ON THIS PROGRAM. SO
16 OBVIOUSLY THEY HAVEN'T MADE THAT.
17 DR. PITTS: STAN?
18 DR. GLANTZ: I HAVE SORT OF A LOGISTICAL SORT OF
19 QUESTION. FOR EXAMPLE, THE ACUTE TOXICITY LEVELS. THERE
20 ARE TWO ASPECTS OF THAT. ONE IS THE GENERAL METHODOLOGY,
21 WHICH IS WHAT I'VE BEEN TALKING TO YOU ABOUT, AND THE
22 OTHER IS THE APPLICATIONS OF SPECIFIC COMPOUNDS; AND I
23 KIND OF WORRY ABOUT A REPORT BEING PUT IN FRONT OF US WITH
24 50 DIFFERENT COMPOUNDS; AND TO ME IT SEEMS LIKE WE MIGHT
25 SORT OF CHOKE, ESPECIALLY -- AND ALSO TO GIVE -- YOU KNOW,
0181
01 YOU'RE PUTTING THESE THINGS OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AND WE
02 SEEM TO BE SPENDING A LOT OF TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENT, AND
03 THEN YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE 50 DIFFERENT CHEMICALS THAT ALL
04 HAVE THEIR FAN CLUBS AND THEY'RE GOING TO BE GOING CRAZY.
05 WOULDN'T IT BE MORE EFFICIENT TO SPREAD THE
06 PROCESS OUT A BIT AND TO HAVE YOU BRING THE METHODOLOGY TO
07 US WITH MAYBE THE FIRST TEN CHEMICALS OR THE TEN MOST

08 IMPORTANT CHEMICALS AND EACH MONTH BRING ANOTHER TEN
09 CHEMICALS? BECAUSE I JUST WORRY ABOUT HOW ARE WE -- WE
10 HAVE THESE LONG DISCUSSIONS ABOUT ONE.
11 HOW ARE WE GOING TO DEAL WITH 50 OF THEM AT
12 ONCE OR IS THE WHOLE PROCESS GOING -- THE OTHER ONE --
13 THIS -- ONCE THE REPORT COMES TO US, ARE THERE LEGAL
14 RESTRICTIONS ON HOW LONG WE CAN SIT ON IT?
15 DR. ALEXEEFF: NO, THERE AREN'T. IN THIS CASE,
16 IT'S ALREADY A T.A.C. SO THERE AREN'T LEGAL RESTRICTIONS.
17 SO ONCE -- HOW THE PANEL WANTS TO HANDLE THE CHEMICALS, IF
18 THEY WANT TO REVIEW THEM IN GROUPS OF TEN OR FIVE, THAT'S
19 PERFECTLY REASONABLE AND YOU'RE RIGHT.
20 YOU KNOW, IN OUR ACUTE DOCUMENT, WE DID HAVE
21 DIFFERENT INDUSTRIES, YOU KNOW, FOCUSING ON CERTAIN
22 CHEMICALS; BUT I THINK THAT SINCE FOR BOTH THE ACUTE AND
23 THE PLANNING, IN PARTICULAR, THERE BASICALLY ARE
24 METHODOLOGIES THAT YOU REALLY HAVEN'T SEEN IN THE PANEL;
25 AND IF YOU CAN LOOK AT 50 CHEMICALS OR 120 CHEMICALS AND
0182
01 SEE WHAT HAPPENS WHEN YOU APPLY THAT METHODOLOGY, THAT
02 WILL REALLY HELP US HONE IN ON WHAT THE METHODOLOGY SHOULD
03 BE.
04 WE'VE TRIED TO ACCOMMODATE ISSUES THAT WERE
05 RAISED IN THE RACK REPORT, WHICH I'M SURE YOU RECALL,
06 DR. SEIBER. ONE IS THE U.S. E.P.A. VALUES WHICH MIGHT
07 EXIST AND THE OTHER ONE HAS TO DO WITH HAVING THOSE
08 METHODOLOGIES USING CERTAINTY FACTORS, AND THERE'S
09 QUESTIONS AS TO USING LOTS OF UNCERTAINTY FACTORS AND THAT
10 BEING A PROBLEM.
11 SO WE'VE TRIED TO WORK ON BOTH OF THOSE FOR
12 THESE IN REVISING -- WELL, PREPARING ONE AND REVISING THE
13 OTHER. SO THAT WILL BE ONE AREA THAT YOU'LL BE ABLE TO
14 GIVE A LOT OF USEFUL INPUT TO SEE WHAT HAPPENS WHEN YOU
15 APPLY UNCERTAINTY FACTORS TO A GROUP OF 50 COMPOUNDS. YOU
16 CAN REALLY GET A SENSE AS TO, "IS THIS METHODOLOGY
17 WORKABLE?"
18 I THINK -- I THINK YOU WILL WANT AT SOME
19 POINT TO LOOK AT THEM ALL TOGETHER BECAUSE THAT WILL HELP
20 WITH THE METHODS.
21 DR. SEIBER: THIS IS REALLY A TEST OF
22 HARMONIZATION. FEDERAL E.P.A. HAS A LIST. WE ALL HAVE
23 THE SAME LIST AND THEY'RE CASTING AROUND LOOKING FOR
24 HELP. WE'RE CASTING AROUND LOOKING FOR HELP AND IT SEEMS
25 LIKE WE CAN EITHER TRADE WORKLOAD OR SOME CAN FOCUS ON
0183
01 SOME CHEMICALS, OTHERS ON ANOTHER GROUP, AND WE'LL GET
02 DONE FASTER BECAUSE THEY'VE GOT EXACTLY THE SAME PROBLEMS.
03 WE ALL STARTED AT THE SAME GAME.
04 DR. GLANTZ: GIVEN ALL THIS, WOULD IT BE
05 WORTHWHILE -- I MEAN, THE ACUTE TOXICITY LEVELS, THERE'S
06 BEEN A PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. NOW, PRESUMING THAT YOU'RE
07 NOT GOING TO HAVE ENDLESS PUBLIC COMMENT PERIODS, WOULD IT
08 BE REASONABLE AFTER YOU FINISH THIS REVISION TO BRING IT
09 TO THE PANEL AS A DISCUSSION OF IT, NOT FOR US TO ACT ON
10 IT NECESSARILY, BUT TO JUST SIMPLY PRESENT IT, DISCUSS IT
11 AND THEN AFTER THAT? CAUSE I JUST WORRY ABOUT CHOKING ON
12 50 CHEMICALS.

13 YOU KNOW, JUST LET US JUST INFORMALLY DISCUSS
14 IT SORT OF IN A WAY OF DIESEL WITHOUT HAVING SEEN THE
15 REPORT; AND THEN AT THAT POINT YOU WOULD MAKE WHATEVER --
16 PERHAPS MAKE SOME MORE REVISIONS, WHATEVER YOU WANT, AND
17 THEN IT WOULD GO OUT FOR THE FORMAL REPORT AND THEN COME
18 BACK TO US AFTER THAT.
19 WOULD THAT BE A SENSIBLE WAY TO PROCEED? TO
20 GET THE PANEL'S INVOLVEMENT IN IT, YOU KNOW, A LITTLE BIT
21 EARLIER IN THE PROCESS? WE WOULDN'T VOTE ON IT. IT
22 WOULDN'T COME TO US AS AN ACTION ITEM. IT WOULD COME AS
23 AN INFORMATIONAL ITEM FOR DISCUSSION. WOULD THAT BE A
24 HELPFUL THING TO DO, DO YOU THINK? I'M NOT SAYING WE
25 SHOULD DO THIS. I'M JUST TRYING TO SPREAD THE WORKLOAD
0184
01 OUT A LITTLE BIT.
02 DR. SEIBER: WELL, I'D RATHER SEE ALL 50 OR 60 OF
03 THEM AND THEN SAY, "OUT OF THIS 50 OR 60, LET'S START WITH
04 THESE TEN." IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE THINKING?
05 DR. GLANTZ: THAT'S AN ALTERNATIVE STRATEGY.
06 DR. SEIBER: INSTEAD OF LETTING THEM PICK OUT TEN
07 FIRST, I'D LIKE TO SEE ALL 50 AND THEN MAKE A CUT.
08 REALLY, IT'S A PRIORITIZATION.
09 DR. ALEXEEFF: WELL, SINCE YOU TWO ARE THE LEADS,
10 I'D BE HAPPY TO WORK WITH YOU --
11 DR. GLANTZ: YEAH. THAT'S TRUE.
12 DR. ALEXEEFF: -- AND I THINK OUR INTENTION WAS
13 TO --
14 DR. GLANTZ: WE SHOULD NOT HAVE OPENED OUR MOUTHS.
15 DR. ALEXEEFF: WELL, OUR INTENTION WAS TO GO
16 THROUGH A -- THE NEXT DRAFT WOULD BE THE S.R.P. REVIEW
17 DRAFT WITH THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.
18 DR. GLANTZ: OKAY.
19 DR. ALEXEEFF: AND THEN IT COMES TO YOU. THAT WAS
20 OUR INTENTION ON THAT, BUT WE FELT THAT THIS EXPOSURE
21 ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT HAD TO COME OUT FIRST BECAUSE OF THE
22 QUESTIONS. WE HAD SO MANY QUESTIONS ABOUT OTHER THINGS
23 GOING ON IN THIS PROGRAM THAT WE FELT, YOU KNOW, IT'S A
24 CHICKEN-AND-EGG QUESTION AS TO WHAT DO YOU NEED TO KNOW
25 FIRST?
0185
01 WE'VE HAD DISCUSSIONS HERE ABOUT EXPOSURE AND
02 HEALTH LEVELS, AND SO I THINK DR. SEIBER HEARD A LOT AT
03 THE RACK MEETING WHERE THE QUESTION'S "WHAT'S THE PURPOSE
04 OF THIS?" "WHAT'S THE PURPOSE OF THESE NUMBERS?" THAT
05 WAS THE QUESTION THAT KEPT COMING UP.
06 SO IF YOU COULD SEE HOW THE NUMBERS, WHAT THE
07 WHOLE PROCESS IS, I THINK THAT HELPS PUT THE CHEMICALS IN
08 PERSPECTIVE; BUT -- SO OUR INTENTION WAS TO SEND AN S.R.P.
09 REVIEW DRAFT, YOU KNOW, EARLY NEXT YEAR OR MIDDLE NEXT
10 YEAR TO THE PANEL.
11 (PAUSE IN THE PROCEEDINGS)
12 DR. PITTS: IS THE NEW PROCESS GOING TO BE AFTER WE
13 GO THROUGH ALL THIS WE WILL GO THROUGH THIS AND WE WILL
14 HAVE COMPOUND ACTS AND COMPOUND ACTS? THREE PAGES OR FOUR
15 PAGES OF THIS TOXICITY OR FIVE PAGES WITH NO REFERENCES?
16 I MEAN, NO DETAILS, NO REFERENCES AS TO HOW THAT WENT ON
17 AND NO INFORMATION AS TO HOW THAT WAS ARRIVED AT? I MEAN

18 SPECIFIC REFERENCES.
19 DR. ALEXEEFF: NO. THERE'S ABOUT 30 OR 40
20 REFERENCES PER CHEMICAL.
21 DR. PITTS: BUT --
22 DR. ALEXEEFF: THERE'S ACTUALLY A LOT OF
23 REFERENCES.
24 DR. PITTS: BUT IT'S NOT EQUIVALENT. THREE TO FOUR
25 PAGES AND -- MAYBE WE WERE DOING IT TOO VERBOSE. OF
0186
01 COURSE, THE COMMITTEE'S KNOWN TO BE SHORT AND PRECISE WITH
02 EVERY COMMENT; BUT SERIOUSLY, HOW CAN YOU BOIL IT DOWN TO
03 TWO PAGES?
04 HOW DO YOU REVIEW A SCIENTIFIC RISK
05 ASSESSMENT LIKE THIS, TAKE OUT THE PUBLIC COMMENTS AND
06 MAKE IT -- HOW DO YOU BOIL IT DOWN TO THREE OR FOUR PAGES
07 OF YOUR COMMENTS OF THIS -- YOUR ASSESSMENT OF THE
08 LITERATURE FOLLOWED BY THREE OR FOUR PAGES OF EXPOSURE
09 AND -- I'M NOT OBJECTING -- AND SAY THAT NOW IS A
10 SCIENTIFIC RISK ASSESSMENT FOR COMPOUND X?
11 IS THAT WHAT IT'S GOING TO BE IN THE FUTURE?
12 THERE WILL BE NO MORE DETAILED RISK ASSESSMENTS OF THE
13 TYPE OTHER THAN PERHAPS THOSE THAT ARE ON THE LIST?
14 LET'S SAY TAKE THOSE ON THE H.A.P.'S LIST
15 FIRST. METHYL BROMIDE THAT WILL COME OUT WITH FOUR PAGES
16 OF CHEMISTRY OF EXPOSURE, FOUR PAGES OF EFFECTS AND THAT'S
17 IT, RIGHT? AND NO EASY-OUT REFERENCES, NO UNDERSTANDING
18 OF THE -- IS THAT WHAT WE'RE SAYING? THAT'S WHAT WE'LL BE
19 PRODUCING?
20 IT WILL NOT BE A ASSIGNED RISK ASSESSMENT OR
21 SOME OTHER INDUSTRIAL CHEMICAL? AM I RIGHT ABOUT THAT?
22 THAT'S A HUGE CONCEPT. I THINK IT DETERMINES WHAT THE
23 PANEL'S GOING TO BE DOING.
24 DR. SEIBER: IT'S NOT NECESSARILY BAD.
25 DR. PITTS: I DIDN'T SAY IT WAS BAD. I DIDN'T SAY
0187
01 IT WAS BAD.
02 DR. SEIBER: I DON'T KNOW WHETHER IT'S POSSIBLE.
03 DR. PITTS: WELL, I'M NOT SAYING IT'S BAD. I'M
04 SIMPLY SAYING THAT'S A TOTALLY DIFFERENT OPERATIONAL
05 APPROACH, BUT LET'S SAY THERE'S 20, 30, 40 THAT ARE REALLY
06 IMPORTANT. THAT'S A VERY DIFFERENT APPROACH AND VERY
07 DIFFERENT APPROACH THE PANEL WILL HAVE.
08 MS. DENTON: DR. PITTS, THROUGH THE 1807 PROCESS,
09 THESE DETAILED RISK ASSESSMENTS --
10 DR. PITTS: THAT'S RIGHT.
11 MS. DENTON: -- WERE USED BY THE A.R.B. AND THE
12 BOARD TO DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT SOMETHING SHOULD BE LISTED
13 AS A TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT IN CALIFORNIA, SO ALL THAT
14 DETAILED INFORMATION WAS NECESSARY FOR THAT DETERMINATION
15 THAT THEY SHOULD BE IDENTIFIED.
16 DR. PITTS: I UNDERSTAND.
17 MS. DENTON: WELL, NOW WE HAVE THIS WHOLE
18 BASKETLOAD OF COMPOUNDS THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED, SO THAT
19 STEP IS NO LONGER WHAT IS OCCURRING. WHAT'S OCCURRING NOW
20 IS THE NEED NOW THAT THEY HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED, WHAT ARE
21 THE HEALTH NUMBERS? AND DEPENDING ON THOSE HEALTH
22 NUMBERS, WHETHER, IN FACT, CONTROL SHOULD BE EVALUATED.

23 SO THAT'S WHY I'VE EXCHANGED --
24 DR. PITTS: THAT'S A DIFFERENT PROCESS.
25 MS. DENTON: RIGHT. AND WHY THE WHOLE PANEL NOW IS
0188
01 EVOLVING TOWARDS THE REVIEW OF THIS NEXT BIG GROUP OF
02 INFORMATION OF THIS GUIDELINES.
03 DR. PITTS: BUT WHO DOES THE IDENTIFICATION?
04 THEY'VE BEEN IDENTIFIED AS A FORMALITY. BASICALLY THEY
05 WENT THROUGH 190. THEY'VE PICKED SOME NUMBERS AND THROWN
06 IT IN, AND THERE IT IS. SO YOU MIGHT IDENTIFY THEM A
07 PROCEDURAL LEGISLATIVE FORMALITY OUT OF THE CLEAN AIR ACT,
08 BUT YOU'RE NOT IDENTIFYING -- WE WERE IDENTIFYING
09 COMPOUNDS. THE ORIGINAL IDENTIFICATION WAS A MEDICAL
10 SCIENTIFIC --
11 MS. DENTON: RISK ASSESSMENT.
12 DR. PITTS: -- DETAILED MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT.
13 YOU'RE SAYING FOR EACH OF THESE COMPOUNDS YOUR STAFF HAS
14 DONE THE SAME DETAILED IDENTIFICATION PROCESS THAT YOU DID
15 FOR BENZENE? THAT YOU DID FOR VINYL CHLORIDE? FOR EACH
16 ONE OF THOSE 54? ONLY BOIL IT DOWN TO US IN THREE PAGES
17 AND TELL US TO APPROVE IT OR NOT APPROVE IT?
18 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, I THINK IT'S LIKE WITH THE 1807
19 DOCUMENTS. I THINK ONCE THEY END UP IN FRONT OF THE
20 PANEL, THE SITUATION WILL EVOLVE; BUT IN THINKING ABOUT
21 IT, IF YOU THINK ABOUT THE BIG, THICK DOCUMENTS, THE
22 RISK -- THE ACTUAL RISK ESTIMATE IS TEN PAGES.
23 SO IT MAY -- YOU KNOW, WHERE THEY'RE ACTUALLY
24 SAYING IS "HERE IS HOW WE CAME UP WITH THE UNIT RISK AND
25 WHAT STUDIES WE USED" AND ALL OF THAT, SO IT MAY NOT BE
0189
01 THAT IT'S AS RIDICULOUS AS IT SOUNDS.
02 DR. PITTS: I DIDN'T SAY IT WAS RIDICULOUS. I SAID
03 IT'S DIFFERENT.
04 DR. GLANTZ: IT'S NOT RIDICULOUS.
05 DR. ALEXEEFF: I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THEY'RE
06 EXTREMELY FOCUSED DOCUMENTS. WE FOCUS ON WHAT IS THE KEY
07 ACUTE EFFECT AND WE DO HAVE REFERENCES IN THERE AND WE DO
08 CONSIDER THEM, YOU KNOW, GOOD SCIENCE.
09 DR. PITTS: AGAIN, LET ME ASK A QUESTION.
10 DR. FROINES: LET ME ASK --
11 DR. PITTS: LET HIM JUST FINISH.
12 DR. ALEXEEFF: BUT IT'S JUST FOCUS, AS OPPOSED TO
13 WHAT WE WENT THROUGH FOR THE 1807 PROCESS WHERE WE LOOKED
14 AT EVERY ASPECT OF THE CHEMICAL.
15 DR. PITTS: IT'S VERY DIFFERENT. WELL, FOCUS. IT
16 DEPENDS ON WHAT YOU'RE FOCUSING ON. OKAY. NOW, WE HAVE
17 NOT ONE OF THE 119'S. IT'S NOT THIS BAND OF 7 OR THE
18 INFAMOUS BAND OF 19. IT'S ANOTHER COMPOUND ENTIRELY.
19 YOU'LL KNOW WHAT ONE OF THEM WILL BE.
20 JUST TAKE ONE. NOW, WHAT KIND OF A PROCESS
21 FOR THAT COMPOUND WILL THAT BE SUBJECTED TO? WILL THAT GO
22 THROUGH THE CLASSIC 1807, SHALL WE CALL IT? THAT'S
23 DISCRIMINATION. THAT'S NOT FAIR. HERE IT ISN'T; AND IF I
24 WERE AN INDUSTRY THAT WENT THROUGH THIS WHOLE THING, THAT
25 HAD TO GO THROUGH TWO YEARS OF AN 1807 AND ANOTHER ONE WAS
0190
01 A THREE-PAGE, I'D BE KIND OF CONCERNED HOW I WENT TO THAT,

02 TO A SHORT THREE-PAGE SUMMARY. I THINK THAT'S A VERY
03 IMPORTANT POINT.
04 MS. DENTON: DR. PITTS --
05 DR. PITTS: HOW DETAILED ARE YOU GOING TO BE? IT'S
06 UNFAIR TREATMENT. I WOULD THINK IF YOU WANT TO USE UNFAIR
07 TREATMENT, SOME POINT OF VIEW TO SOMEONE ADMITTING THESE
08 THINGS, WHY ARE WE SUBMITTING THIS TWO-YEAR INCREDIBLY
09 DETAILED BUNCH OF COMPOUNDS WHEN SO-AND-SO HAS GONE TO THE
10 PANEL IN DETAIL, AS AGAINST THE REST OF THEM.
11 TO HELL WITH THE OTHER 54 THAT WENT TOGETHER
12 WITH FOUR PAGES AND SUMMARIZED IT, AND THAT'S WHAT THEY
13 ARE. THAT'S A VERY DIFFERENT KIND OF FISH.
14 MS. DENTON: OUR LIST, AS YOU REMEMBER, CONTAINS
15 200 -- UPWARDS OF 200 SUBSTANCES THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED
16 AND ABOUT 30 THAT HAVE NOT BEEN IDENTIFIED; AND IN OUR
17 EVALUATION, THOSE SUBSTANCES THAT HAVE NOT BEEN
18 IDENTIFIED, SHOULD WE ENTER THEM INTO THE PROCESS, THEN,
19 OF COURSE, CAN TAKE THIS FULL-SCALE EFFORT THAT YOU'VE --
20 DR. PITTS: ARE THEY ANY OF THE 30 THAT YOU THINK
21 ARE BAD ACTORS OR BAD ACTRESSES? TO BE PERFECTLY FAIR IN
22 THIS --
23 MS. DENTON: WE DID A PRELIMINARY SCREENING,
24 DR. PITTS, AND BASICALLY ALL -- WE DID A PRIORITIZATION OF
25 ALL OF THE SUBSTANCES THAT WE HAVE BOTH ON THE LIST THAT
0191
01 HAVE BEEN I.D.'D AND -- WELL, THE WHOLE GROUP AND ALL 30.
02 WELL, 29 OUT OF THOSE 30 WERE H.A.P.'S OR SUBSTANCES WHICH
03 HAD BEEN IDENTIFIED, SO WE BELIEVE THE SUBSTANCES THAT ARE
04 ON THAT 30, ENTERING THEM INTO THE PROCESS RESOURCEWISE IS
05 LESS IMPORTANT THAN GETTING THE 1731 GUIDELINES AND HEALTH
06 INFORMATION OUT AND DEVELOPED.
07 DR. FROINES: BUT THAT REALLY DOES -- THIS TAKES
08 YOU BACK TO THE NITROAERIN IMPRESSION. THAT REALLY DOES.
09 YOU'VE MADE INTERPRETATION OF WHAT CONSTITUTES THE MAJOR
10 PUBLIC HEALTH ISSUE AROUND MAJOR TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS.
11 I'D LOVE TO SEE THAT DOCUMENT THAT YOU'VE DRAWN
12 CONCLUSIONS FROM BECAUSE I DON'T BELIEVE IT EXISTS.
13 SECONDLY, I DON'T BELIEVE IT. IF I LOOK AT
14 LOS ANGELES AIR AND LOOK AT THE WORK THAT ROGER ATKINSON
15 HAS DONE, THERE'S SOME VERY IMPORTANT COMPOUNDS THAT WE
16 SHOULD BE ADDRESSING AND I DON'T SEE WHY WE'RE NOT AND
17 SOME DAY I WANT AN ANSWER TO THAT, BECAUSE I'VE BEEN
18 ASKING IT FOR ABOUT FIVE, SEVEN YEARS.
19 WHY ARE WE NOT ADDRESSING COMPOUNDS THAT
20 A.R.B. HAS PAID MONEY TO FIND ARE IMPORTANT AIR
21 CONTAMINANTS THAT HAVE HIGH MUTANICITY AND CARCINOGENS?
22 THOSE CAN BE GONE RIGHT THROUGH.
23 THE SECOND THING I WANT TO COMMENT IS WHEN WE
24 GET INTO THE R.E.L.'S AND ACUTE TOXICITY, GEORGE IS RIGHT
25 THAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO HAVE SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT
0192
01 METHODOLOGY.
02 I DON'T KNOW WHY WE'RE NOT USING A BENCHMARK
03 APPROACH, FOR EXAMPLE, RELATIVE TO A TRADITIONAL
04 IDENTIFIED FACTOR APPROACH. THOSE ARE METHODOLOGIC
05 ISSUES. ARE THERE ANY MECHANISTIC APPROACHES THAT CAN BE
06 USED? IS THE UPBEAT DATA AVAILABLE TO AVOID USING THE

07 SAFETY FACTOR APPROACHES?
08 IN OTHER WORDS, I THINK THAT ONE THING WE
09 BETTER BE CLEAR ON IS THAT THIS PANEL BETTER HAVE SOME
10 SESSIONS WHERE WE DEAL WITH THE METHODOLOGY OF THE RISK
11 ASSESSMENT BEFORE WE GET TO THE 54 COMPOUNDS AND START
12 CATFIGHTING ABOUT HOW WE DECIDE AND WHAT WAS WHAT.
13 AND THE THIRD THING I WANT TO COMMENT ON
14 WHILE I'M SITTING HERE IS ARE WE GOING TO BE DEFINING
15 SPECIFIC REFERENCE LEVELS, FOR EXAMPLE?
16 DR. ALEXEEFF: YES.
17 DR. FROINES: AND WE'RE DEALING WITH A RANGE ON
18 DIESEL, BUT WE ARE GOING TO SEE THE LIGHT ON THE NEXT
19 COMPOUNDS DOWN THE ROAD? WE'RE NOT GOING TO HAVE TO DO
20 THAT FOR DIESEL, BUT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE TO DO THAT FOR
21 ALL THE OTHERS? REMEMBER THE RANGE OF CANCERS THAT WE
22 TALKED ABOUT THIS MORNING?
23 DR. PITTS: SURE DO.
24 DR. ALEXEEFF: AS I RECALL, THE WAY THE
25 STATUTE'S -- IS KIRK HERE?
0193
01 MS. DENTON: NO.
02 DR. ALEXEEFF: AS I RECALL, THE WAY THE STATUTE IS
03 WRITTEN, IF IT HAS A THRESHOLD, THEN YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO
04 INCORPORATE AN ADEQUATE MARGIN OF SAFETY AND THE HEALTH
05 LEVEL; AND IF THERE IS NO THRESHOLD, YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO
06 ASSIGN THE RANGE OF LISTING.
07 I BELIEVE THAT'S THE WAY THE STATUTE IS
08 WRITTEN, SO -- I MEAN, I DON'T -- SO I THINK IN CANCER --
09 AND THAT'S WHY WE HAD PART WHERE WE HAD THIS RANGE OF RISK
10 FOR LEAD.
11 DR. FROINES: WE HAVE A UNIT RISK VALUE FOR ALL
12 THESE COMPOUNDS.
13 DR. ALEXEEFF: EXCUSE ME?
14 DR. FROINES: WE HAVE A UNIT RISK VALUE THAT WE USE.
15 DR. ALEXEEFF: OH, YOU MEAN THE BEST ESTIMATE FOR
16 THE CANCER?
17 DR. FROINES: YES.
18 DR. ALEXEEFF: BUT WE ALSO HAVE TO DEFINE A RANGE
19 OF RISK.
20 DR. FROINES: WE DEFINE THE RANGES, BUT WE DEFINE
21 THE RISK VALUE.
22 DR. ALEXEEFF: UH-HUH.
23 DR. SEIBER: WELL, YOUR ONE QUESTION OR POINT ABOUT
24 BRINGING THE DOCUMENTS AND SETTLING ON THE METHODOLOGY, I
25 THINK THAT'S WHAT I UNDERSTOOD. WHEN THEY RELEASE THESE
0194
01 THINGS, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY -- WE'VE GOT
02 LEAD PEOPLE ASSIGNED FOR TWO OF THEM, AND I SUPPOSE WE
03 WILL FOR THE OTHER THREE AND WE'LL HAVE A DISCUSSION AS A
04 PANEL.
05 DR. FROINES: WELL, I THINK WE SHOULD HAVE A PANEL
06 MEETING WHERE WE DISCUSS THE METHODOLOGY AND THE SECOND
07 PANEL MEETING --
08 DR. ALEXEEFF: THAT WOULD BE GOOD.
09 DR. FROINES: -- AS TO CHEMICAL.
10 DR. ALEXEEFF: BECAUSE YOU DO TAKE THE DOCUMENT AND
11 JUST LIMIT THE DISCUSSION TO METHODOLOGY. THERE'S A

12 COUPLE OF ISSUES. LIKE IN THE ACUTE DOCUMENT. I FORGET,
13 BUT I THINK WE HAVE MAYBE 15 OR 20 BENCHMARK
14 COMPOSITIONS.
15 IT'S A SIMILAR ISSUE TO WHAT WE GRAPPLED
16 WITH -- WELL, IT'S NOT SO MUCH CARCINOGENS, BUT IT'S HUMAN
17 VERSUS ANIMAL DATA. THE ANIMAL DATA IS VERY SPECIFIC BUT
18 REQUIRES MORE EXTRAPOLATION THAN HUMAN, WHICH IS UNCLEAR
19 WHAT THE EXPOSURE WAS; AND THAT IS ONE THAT -- YOU KNOW,
20 HOW ONE WEIGHS THAT.
21 AND IN THESE ASSESSMENTS, GENERALLY THERE'S A
22 TENFOLD FACTOR THAT'S CONSIDERED BETWEEN HUMANS AND
23 ANIMALS, AND IS THAT REALLY -- AND THERE'S A LOT OF
24 METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES THAT COULD BE DISCUSSED. I THINK
25 THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO US.
0195
01 DR. SEIBER: BUT WHEN YOU ADD DIESEL AND
02 ENVIRONMENTAL AND TOBACCO SMOKE, ALL OF THESE DOCUMENTS,
03 THE 50 OR 75 CHEMICALS PLUS WHAT D.P.R. IS PROBABLY GOING
04 TO BRING US, WE'VE GOT A HECK OF A LOT OF WORK TO DO. I'M
05 NOT THINKING WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH. I THINK WE'VE GOT WAY
06 MORE THAN WE CAN HANDLE.
07 DR. FROINES: I WAS TRYING TO PUSH IT BECAUSE I
08 WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT WHEN WE GOT THIS TOO MUCH WORK TO
09 DO THAT WE GOT IT BEFORE 1998, WHICH IS WHAT I'M CONCERNED
10 ABOUT.
11 DR. GLANTZ: THAT'S A RECURRING THEME. YOU COULD,
12 LIKE, TAKE IT BACK TO YOUR MANAGER.
13 DR. ALEXEEFF: I SEE.
14 DR. PITTS: ONE OF THE THINGS IF WE WERE TO GO
15 THROUGH THE METHODOLOGIES, WHY -- COULD YOU JUST BREAK
16 SOMETHING -- LIKE BREAK THESE 54 COMPOUNDS INTO CLASSES OF
17 COMPOUNDS, POLYCYCLICS, NITRO, CHLORINATED METHYL
18 HYDROXIDES, THAT TYPE OF THING. THROW IN AN ETHYLENE
19 OXIDE AND HYDROXIDE.
20 BREAK IT TO FIVE CLASSES SO WHEN WE DISCUSS
21 METHODOLOGY, DISCUSS METHODOLOGY IN TERMS OF THE SPECIFIC
22 COMPOUND OR THE SPECIFIC CLASS OF COMPOUNDS, SO WE'LL ALL
23 HAVE SOME UNDERSTANDING OF THE CHEMISTRIES INVOLVED SO WE
24 CAN APPLY IT.
25 YOU'RE NOT TRYING -- WE CAN APPLY -- I'M MORE
0196
01 HAPPY ABOUT APPLYING A GENERAL METHODOLOGY IF I'M THINKING
02 ABOUT TERMS OF GENERAL CLASSIC COMPOUNDS. THEN I CAN
03 APPLY IT. IT MIGHT BE QUITE DIFFERENT OTHERWISE.
04 CERTAINLY THE EXPOSURE ASPECTS ARE GOING TO
05 BE A HECK OF A LOT DIFFERENT, BUT IF I SUSPECT THE
06 EFFECTS, PUT IT IN A CONTEXT OF SOMETHING SO WE ARE
07 LOOKING AT A REAL LIVE TOXIC CHEMICAL COMPOUND AND THERE
08 ARE FIVE OR SO CLASSES.
09 DR. GLANTZ: IN ORDER -- WE'VE DECIDED TO MEET
10 EVERY COUPLE OF MONTHS, SO WE'LL PROBABLY MEET AGAIN IN
11 FEBRUARY.
12 DR. PITTS: I THINK EVERY TWO WEEKS, AS I SEE
13 COMING.
14 DR. GLANTZ: WELL, THEN WE'LL BE ACCELERATING.
15 MAYBE AT THE MEETING WE'LL PROBABLY HAVE IN FEBRUARY,
16 WOULD IT BE REASONABLE TO HAVE GEORGE COME IN AND GIVE US

17 A MORE DETAILED BRIEFING ABOUT THE SPECIFICS OF HOW
18 THEY'RE DOING THIS SO WE CAN HAVE A DISCUSSION OF IT?
19 DR. PITTS: YEAH. WITH COMPOUNDS.
20 DR. GLANTZ: IT WOULDN'T BE FINALIZED AT THAT
21 POINT, BUT AT LEAST WE COULD HAVE A DISCUSSION OF IT AND
22 YOU COULD GET SOME INPUT FROM THE GROUP IN TERMS -- BEFORE
23 YOU BRING THE DOCUMENT BACK FOR FORMAL APPROVAL.
24 DR. PITTS: WALK US THROUGH A COUPLE OF EXAMPLES.
25 I MEAN, HOW DO YOU --
0197
01 DR. ALEXEEFF: WELL, OUR HOPE WOULD BE THAT WE
02 COULD DO THAT, PARTICULARLY ON THE EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT AND
03 THE STOCHASTIC ANALYSIS ONE. THAT, WE WOULD LIKE. IT
04 SHOULD BE, DEPENDING ON WHEN THE MEETING IS, AT THE END OF
05 THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. WE WOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS THE
06 METHODOLOGY WE USED IN THAT DOCUMENT AND GET SOME -- YOU
07 KNOW, YOU KNOW, GET SOME FEEDBACK AS WE'RE MAKING A FINAL
08 REVISION ON IT, AND I THINK THAT THAT MIGHT BE -- I THINK
09 WE'VE HAD SOME REALLY USEFUL COMMENTS HERE, ESPECIALLY ON
10 PACKAGING THESE CHEMICALS.
11 IT'S STIMULATED ME ON HOW YOU MIGHT WANT TO
12 PACKAGE THESE AND WE CAN DISCUSS IT WITH THE LEAD PERSONS,
13 ALTHOUGH WITH ALL RESPECT TO CHEMISTS, I ALSO MAJORED IN
14 CHEMISTRY; BUT IN SOME SENSE, IT MAY BE USEFUL TO PACKAGE
15 THOSE THAT ARE BASED ON EPIDEMIOLOGY.
16 ONE COULD LOOK AT LEVEL OF HUMAN EVIDENCE ONE
17 HAS VERSUS ANIMAL OR THAT TYPE OF THING. THERE MAY BE
18 SOME OTHER WAYS OF PACKAGING THESE CHEMICALS INTO GROUPS
19 THAT WILL MAKE IT BETTER FOR THE DISCUSSION TO OCCUR.
20 DR. FROINES: I HAVE SORT OF AN UNRELATED
21 QUESTION. I THINK I AGREE WITH WHAT YOU JUST SAID; BUT IN
22 GOING BACK TO THE ISSUE OF NEW COMPOUNDS COMING BEFORE THE
23 PANEL, BESIDES THE 189, ON THE CARCINOGEN IDENTIFICATION
24 COMMITTEE, LAUREN GOES THROUGH AND DEVELOPS THESE LONG
25 LISTS FOR THE PURPOSES OF PRIORITY SETTING, AND SO YOU'VE
0198
01 DEVELOPED ALL THESE CARCINOGEN DATA AS PARTS OF THAT PROP
02 65 PROCESS.
03 DO YOU THEN LOOK AT THAT DATA TO THINK ABOUT
04 THOSE COMPOUNDS AS TO WHETHER THEY SHOULD BE AT RELEVANCE
05 BEFORE COMING THROUGH THIS PROCESS OR IS THERE A
06 DISCONNECT BETWEEN THE TWO GROUPS?
07 YOU HAVE A LONG LIST OF COMPOUNDS THAT YOU
08 ACTUALLY DEVELOPED SOME LEVEL OF SCIENTIFIC DATA ON IN
09 TERMS OF CARCINOGENICITY AND THEY COULD -- IF THERE'S SOME
10 COMPOUNDS THAT ARE RELEVANT -- VINYL ACETATE IS ONE THAT I
11 REMEMBER FROM THE LAST PROP 65 MEETING. I DON'T KNOW HOW
12 VINYL ACETATE COMES. IT MIGHT BE A HOT SPOT ISSUE FOR
13 ALL I KNOW, PROBABLY NOT AN AMBIENT ISSUE, BUT THAT'S THE
14 POINT.
15 HAVE YOU LOOKED AT THE LIST THAT LAUREN'S
16 DEVELOPED WITH ALL THE DATA THEY PUT TOGETHER TO SEE IF
17 ANY OF THOSE HAVE AIR POLLUTION CONSEQUENCES? YOU LOOK AT
18 MORE THAN TYLENOL.
19 MS. DENTON: I THINK THAT'S A GOOD RESPONSE. WE
20 HAVEN'T DONE THAT IN THE PAST. WE'VE WORKED WITH THIS
21 FINITE LIST.

22 DR. FROINES: WELL, THEY'RE DOING A LOT OF WORK ON
23 PRIORITY SETTING.
24 MS. DENTON: PROP 65. I WANTED TO SAY --
25 DR. SEIBER: I --
0199
01 MS. DENTON: I'M SORRY.
02 DR. SEIBER: I'LL JUST GIVE YOU A QUICK EXAMPLE.
03 THE C.F.C. REPLACEMENTS, WHICH WE ALL KNOW NOW ARE IN
04 WIDESPREAD USE MUCH QUICKER THAN ANY OF US EXPECTED. WHEN
05 THE LIST WAS DRAWN UP IN 1990 OR 1989, I'M NOT EVEN SURE
06 IF PEOPLE WERE THINKING OF C.F.C. REPLACEMENTS.
07 IF THEY'RE NOT ON THE LIST OF 189, AND
08 THERE'S SEVERAL OF THEM -- THERE'S THREE OR FOUR DIFFERENT
09 CHEMICALS. IF THEY'RE NOT ON THERE --
10 DR. PITTS: THEY BETTER. YOU PUT THOSE HYDROGENS
11 AND THOSE HYDROCARBONS.
12 DR. SEIBER: YEAH.
13 DR. FROINES: SOME OF THEM METABOLIZE TO HALOFENE
14 (PHONETIC), SO THEY ACTUALLY --
15 DR. SEIBER: TRY FLUOROACETIC ACID. THAT'S A BIG
16 ONE.
17 DR. PITTS: WELL, IN THE INTEREST OF TRAVEL FOR ALL
18 INVOLVED, I HATE TO BRING THIS DISCUSSION TO A CLOSE. WE
19 MAY HAVE SOME MORE COMMENTS THAT YOU WANT TO MAKE. WE
20 HAVE FLIGHTS OUT, ALTHOUGH MY FLIGHT IS JUST ACROSS THE
21 FREEWAY HERE, BUT I WANT TO TAKE CARE OF YOU PEOPLE.
22 MS. DENTON: I CAN --
23 DR. PITTS: I CAN SIT HERE. I'M NOT THE GUY
24 PUSHING, BUT --
25 MS. DENTON: WELL, SEVERAL -- AS DR. FROINES POINTS
0200
01 OUT, WE HAVE THE ISSUE OF P.M.'S AND NITRO P.A.H.'S COMING
02 UP AT THIS PANEL, AND YOU RECALL THAT WHEN THE P.A.H. WAS
03 IDENTIFIED AS A TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT, WE HAD POTENCY
04 EQUIVALENT FACTORS DEVELOP FOR ABOUT 20 CONTRIBUTING
05 SUBSTANCE FACTORS FOR WHICH WE HAD NO AMBIENT DATA.
06 SO THERE IS A CASE WHERE P.A.H. HELPED DATA.
07 ALBEIT, THEY WERE RELEVANT DATA NUMBERS OF WHICH THEY HAD
08 AMBIENT DATA FOR P.M. DATA, WHICH IS ALL H.A.P.'S, AND
09 WHAT WE DID WAS THROUGH ONE OF OUR CONTRACTS AT THE BOARD,
10 FOR A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME IN 1994 -- AND IT WAS DURING
11 THE SUMMER -- WE ACTUALLY, WHERE WE COULD, MONITORED FOR
12 THOSE P.A.H.'S FOR WHICH WE HAD POTENCY EQUIVALENT
13 FACTORS; AND BASICALLY WHAT WE SHOWED IS THAT THE AMBIENT
14 RISKS -- AGAIN, THIS WAS IN THE SUMMER -- WHEN YOU ADDED
15 UP ALL OF THOSE P.A.H.'S, AND THERE WERE FIVE, NITRO
16 P.A.H.'S WERE LESS THAN ONE POTENTIAL CANCER CASE PER
17 MILLION; BUT ADMITTEDLY THAT WAS IN THE SUMMER.
18 AND THROUGH DATA FROM ROGER ATKINSON, WE
19 THINK THE HOT SPOTS COULD BE SOMEWHAT POSSIBLY 20 TIMES
20 HIGHER THAN THAT. I JUST WANTED TO SHOW YOU THAT WE WERE
21 RESPONSIVE TO YOUR QUESTIONS. IT HAS TAKEN US A COUPLE OF
22 YEARS TO GET THE INFORMATION. THIS IS THE BEGINNING,
23 ADMITTEDLY, OF INFORMATION THAT WILL BE COMING OUT ON
24 P.A.H.'S AND NITRO P.A.H.'S.
25 DR. PITTS: I'D BE VERY CAREFUL ABOUT SAYING THEY
0201

01 ARE CANCEROUS. I'D BE VERY HAPPY TO SEE WHAT THE LEVEL
02 IS, BUT IF YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT A NITRO P.A.H. WHICH HAS
03 SOME 2,000 MICROGRAMS AND IS ONE OF THE HOTTEST THINGS
04 GOING, THERE'S NO TOXICOLOGICAL DATA ON IT. YOU CAN'T DO
05 IT.
06 THAT'S WHAT JOHN'S TALKING ABOUT. WE DON'T
07 HAVE ANY DATA AND I'D BE VERY CAREFUL BECAUSE THESE --
08 THERE'S A WHOLE SERIES OF SPECIES LIKE THAT AND THEY'RE
09 INHALED, SOME OF WHICH ARE PARTICLES LIKE CONDENSED PARTS
10 OF PARTICLES. IT'S ANOTHER STORY.
11 DR. FROINES: I WANT TO SEE THAT DOCUMENT, TOO.
12 DR. PITTS: YEAH. I WANT TO SEE THAT, TOO. I
13 HAVEN'T SEEN IT.
14 DR. FROINES: IF YOU'RE TELLING ME THAT THE RISK
15 FROM ALL POLYCYCLIC CARBONS IS LESS THAN ONE POTENTIAL
16 CANCER CASE --
17 MS. DENTON: NO. THESE ARE THE ONES FOR WHICH WE
18 HAD THE POTENCY EQUIVALENT FACTORS.
19 DR. ALEXEEFF: POTENCY --
20 DR. FROINES: I UNDERSTOOD. THAT'S WHY I SAID IT
21 THAT WAY. THE OTHER FACT IS WE KNOW -- THESE P.A.H. --
22 NITRO P.A.H.'S ARE NOT NECESSARILY THE ONES THAT JANET AND
23 ROGER ARE FINDING.
24 DR. PITTS: LIKE TOMES (PHONETIC).
25 DR. FROINES: SO YOU'RE TALKING APPLES AND ORANGES.
0202
01 DR. PITTS: 2-NITRO AMPOLENE (PHONETIC).
02 WELL, I THINK IN THE INTERESTS -- I DON'T
03 WANT TO BE OVERLY ABRUPT IN THIS, BUT IN THE INTEREST OF
04 GETTING TO THAT AIRPORT ON A BUSY PRE-CHRISTMAS DAY,
05 UNLESS THERE'S SOMETHING WE DISCUSSED, THE POTENTIAL AND
06 THE SUBJECT WILL BE FOR THE NEXT MEETING.
07 WOULD YOU PUT M.T.B.E. ON THAT LIST, TOO? IN
08 A COUPLE OF MONTHS, HOW ABOUT PUTTING M.T.B.E. AND METHYL
09 BROMIDE ON THAT?
10 DR. ALEXEEFF: WELL M.T.B.E. IS ON THE CHRONIC
11 LIST. WE DON'T HAVE ANY DOCUMENTS. METHYL BROMIDE IS ON
12 BOTH.
13 DR. FROINES: IT SAYS BENZYL PYRENE ITSELF IS ONE
14 CANCER.
15 MS. DENTON: RIGHT. AND THOSE WITH THE P.A.H.'S
16 FOR WHICH WE'VE GOT THE POTENCY EQUIVALENT FACTORS.
17 DR. FROINES: WHAT I'M SAYING IS YOU SAID ONE IN A
18 MILLION. THEN BENZYL PYRENE IS ONE, I BELIEVE, AND THAT
19 MEANS NO OTHER P.A.H. CONTRIBUTES RISK.
20 MS. DENTON: PRETTY MINIMAL FROM WHAT THE
21 SUMMERTIME DATA AND THE P.E.F. VALUES WERE.
22 DR. FROINES: I'D LOVE TO SEE THIS DOCUMENT.
23 MS. DENTON: YOU WILL, DR. FROINES.
24 DR. PITTS: DO I HEAR A MOTION TO ADJOURN?
25 DR. GLANTZ: SO MOVE.
0203
01 DR. PITTS: IS THERE A SECOND?
02 DR. SEIBER: SECOND.
03 DR. PITTS: IT'S MOVED AND ALL IN FAVOR?
04 OKAY. THANKS VERY MUCH, GENTLEMEN, AND THOSE
05 WHO HAVE MADE PRESENTATIONS AND THE AUDIENCE. SOME OF YOU

06 STUCK WITH US THE WHOLE DAY AND WE APPRECIATE IT.
07 (PROCEEDING ADJOURNED AT 3:55 P.M.)
08
09
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25