

REGULATORY IMPLICATIONS PANEL

1. One issue from the National Research Council 2008 report “Phthalates and Cumulative Risk Assessment: The Task Ahead” (http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12528) that has generated a lot of controversy is the idea of doing cumulative assessments on chemicals that produce the same outcome. The phthalates example is very circumscribed. **Do you agree or disagree with the idea of defining a common outcome more broadly?** If you do agree, how broadly would you define “common outcome”?

2. If we had better tools for identifying common mode of action, do you believe that cumulative assessments would be more commonly done?

3. If cumulative assessments were more common, would it require more active and/or different approaches to quantifying exposure to multiple chemicals?

4. It may be of use to conduct screening level assessments to determine whether cumulative assessment is even warranted (e.g., because any risk is driven by the exposure level or potency of a single component). **Are current methods such as hazard index or toxic equivalents (TEQs) adequate for this purpose, or is this something that would also rely on emerging science?**

5. There are research and regulatory implications of temporality of exposures—the persistence in the body and timing of multiple impacts on pathways leading to toxicity. Hazard index assumes exposures are happening at the same time; TEQ’s look at cumulative body burden. **Are there other tools that allow us to understand the relative contributions of multichemical exposures for regulatory purposes?**