2013

Minutes of the 9/30 meeting of the NJDEP SAB- Public Health Standing Committee

The meeting was held at 10:00 AM in the Office of the NJDEP Office of Science.

Attendees
Mark Robson (Chair)
Judith Klotz
Gerald Kennedy
Michael Greenberg
Mark Maddaloni (by phone)
Judith Zelikoff (by phone)
Clifford Weisel
Howard Kipen

Absent
Steven Marcus

In support
Alan Stern, NJDEP-Office of Science (Committee Liaison)
Gloria Post, NJDEP-Office of Science
Olga Boyko (NJDEP-Air Program)

Revision of in Response to the Full NJDEP-SAB’s Review of “Considerations for Adding Air Toxics Compounds to the List of Air Pollutants Registered by the NJDEP”

1. The full SAB requested that the report consider chemicals that could pose inhalation exposure due to volatilization from soil.

   The Committee agreed to mention the possibility of soil-air sources in the report. In a similar vein, the Committee identified asbestos airborne entrainment from contaminated soil as a potential route of exposure and agreed to add this to the report.

2. The full SAB suggested that the report should indicate support for NJDEP maintaining its current capabilities for conduction risk assessments when necessary, and for developing additional risk assessment capabilities.
The Committee added wording emphasizing existing risk assessment capability in the NJDEP and also added as statement that those capabilities should be expanded if possible.

3. The full SAB requested that the report include reference to the exposure framework software being developed by EOHSI.

   The Committee agreed to add such language.

4. A member of the full SAB suggested that the NJDEP should consider the impact of an expanded list of Air Toxics entries on the regulatory burden of the department.

   The Committee considered this to be a general suggestion to the NJDEP rather than a specific request for revision of the report. The Committee suggested that the full SAB indicate in its letter to the Commissioner transmitting the report that additional comments related to the implementation of the recommendations in the report were received from the full SAB.

5. A member of the full SAB suggested that the report include information for the regulated community as to how to deal with the chemicals on the Air Toxics list.

   As above, the Committee considered this to be a general comment to the NJDEP a suggested that the full SAB indicate in its letter to the Commissioner transmitting the report that additional comments related to the implementation of the recommendations in the report were received from the full SAB.

   These changes were subsequently incorporated into the finalized report and the finalized report was transmitted to Judith Weis, Chair of the full SAB.

Consideration of the NJ Biomonitoring Charge Questions

*Action items are shown in bold*

The Committee began consideration of the charge questions relating to the development of a NJ Biomonitoring Program.

The specific charge questions as transmitted by the Commissioner to the full SAB are:

   What are the needs and scope of a NJ- specific human biomonitoring program?

   What are the appropriate structures and mechanisms for collecting and interpreting representative biomonitoring data?
Alan Stern gave a Power Point presentation summarizing the proposal submitted by the NJDOH, NJDEP, EOHSI and others in 2003 to the CDC in response to its Request for Proposals for biomonitoring. That proposal was well received but ultimately, not funded.

Mark Robson requested that the Public Health Standing Committee meet as a committee of the whole to consider this issue.

A Committee member suggested that the approach to be designed and recommended by the SAB should have an environmental justice (EJ) focus addressing specific communities possibly through the USEPA’s EJ initiatives.

The Committee questioned whether a NJ biomonitoring program should be developed specifically through the NJDEP or whether it should have a broader focus.

The Committee discussed several possible guiding structures and questions:

- The public health approach and rationale for such a program should be defined

- Consider how NJ can address national needs through a NJ-based approach and how addressing those national needs could lead to partnering with federal agencies

- In particular what opportunities are available for coordination with the ongoing NHANES biomonitoring effort?
  
  o In particular what opportunities are available for coordination with the ongoing NHANES biomonitoring effort? this is same as above

- The biomonitoring effort should be designed to provide information that is useful for supporting regulation

It was suggested that the NYC DOH be invited to present its experience in developing its NYC-HANES biomonitoring program. Mark Maddaloni volunteered to make the initial contact.

Mark Maddaloni subsequently contacted Wendy McKelvey of NYC-DOH who enthusiastically agreed to speak to the Committee.

The Committee should next decide on a venue for such a presentation

It was suggested that a biomonitoring effort should be guided by information on sources and activities predicting exposures and routes of remediation of exposure. These could include
questionnaires, surveys, and sources of emissions in communities based on existing or new monitoring data.

It was suggested that a NJ biomonitoring effort should supplement the national NHANES program with NJ-specific exposure information that would be useful on a national basis (filling in gaps in the NHANES database). This could take the form of *de novo* data (e.g., on chemicals not addressed by NHANES). Such a proposal would need to make the case for collaboration with CDC (and for NJ support) in terms of benefit to public health. One avenue for this could be through CDC’s Environmental Public Health Tracking initiative.

Another suggestion was to pursue funding through the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation under a proposal addressing: “What is the extent of exposure to selected toxicants of individuals living in selected economically and environmentally stressed urban and industrialized neighborhoods compared to individuals residing in suburban, exurban, and rural areas of NJ?”

**Mark Robson created a sub-committee to develop the charge question and structure it in a way that can be used to identify needed information including clarifying the analytical inventory.**

**The following Committee members were asked to participate in the sub-committee in addition to Mark Robson: Judith Klotz, Cliff Weisel and Michael Greenberg. Alan Stern will continue his liaison function with the sub-committee.**

**Mark Robson requested that Judith Klotz chair the sub-committee. She asked that her decision be deferred until after the middle of November due to personal commitments.**

**A meeting of the sub-committee will be scheduled shortly for early-mid November.**