

To: 'carol.a.fairbrother@exxonmobil.com' <carol.a.fairbrother@exxonmobil.com>;
'Broddle, William' <bill.d.broddle@usa.conoco.com>; 'burnetdm@bp.com' <burnetdm@bp.com>;
'sptsai@shell.com' <sptsai@shell.com>; 'szcagen@Shell.Com' <szcagen@Shell.Com>
From: Dawn Hebron <HebronD@api.org>
Cc: Lorraine Twerdok <twerdokl@api.org>; George Woodall <Woodallg@api.org>;
'Patrick Beatty(Home)' <matheny@pacbell.net>
Bcc:
Received Date: 2001-07-20 19:20:57 GMT
Subject: Benzene Technical Committee teleconference

Our conference call has been scheduled for July 23rd at 11am EST. To be connected to the call please dial 703-736-7274 and ask to be connected to the call moderated by George Woodall of API. Your confirmation number for the call is 5411972. Below is a note from Patrick.

Technical Committee Members,

I apologize for the short lead time on this message, but other issues forced me to put this off longer than I wished.

One of the items that we need to discuss on our conference call is the size and composition of the Scientific Review Panel. I would like to send a consensus recommendation to the Oversight Committee at their July 26th meeting. Below I have penned (typed?) some of my thoughts. To use as a starting place for our consideration. If you have ideas for additional candidates, please bring them to the call or e-mail them prior if time allows. Most of the candidates have not been approached about participation at this time. I would like to prioritize 2 or 3 individuals for each slot on the Panel.

THE ISSUES: Size, Composition (Disciplines), Nominees

Size: Trying to balance between a Panel that is small enough to be workable and with a reasonable chance of getting a sizeable majority available at the same time for conference calls or meetings as needed versus having the right types of expertise (not to mention representation by regulatory bodies) is going to be quite a balancing act. How is that for a run-on sentence? My preference is to try to limit it to 10 members if possible. I don't think that we can get away with fewer than that based on the expertise we need. See next issue. I also think that we should absolutely not go over 12.

Composition: Of the areas of expertise that I have identified (by no means all) three are so important in my mind as to require more than one Panel member. Those disciplines are epidemiology, hematology and industrial hygiene. My list is as follows:

Epidemiology - 2

Industrial Hygiene/Exposure Assessment - 2

Clinical Hematology/Oncology - 2

Hematopathology - 1

Statistics/Data Analysis - 1

Genetic Toxicology/Cytogenetics - 1

General Biochemical Toxicology/Metabolism -1

Other considerations include: need to have at least one US regulatory body included, credibility with agencies/NGOs, free from conflict of interest (as practicably as possible no history of industry funding or litigation), experience with occupational studies.

Nominees:

To: burnettdm@bp.com <burnettdm@bp.com>; szcagen@shell.com
<szcagen@shell.com>; sptsai@shell.com <sptsai@shell.com>; carol.a.fairbrother@exxonmobil.com
<carol.a.fairbrother@exxonmobil.com>; bill.d.broddle@usa.conoco.com <bill.d.broddle@usa.conoco.com>;
woodallg@api.org <woodallg@api.org>; twerdokl@api.org <twerdokl@api.org>; pwbe@chevron.com
<pwbe@chevron.com>; matheny@pacbell.net <matheny@pacbell.net>
From: Catherine Beatty <matheny@postoffice.pacbell.net>
Cc:
Bcc:
Received Date: 2001-07-23 08:04:52 GMT
Subject: [Fwd: Benzene Technical Committee teleconference]

Attachments:

Re: Benzene Technical Committee teleconference

To: Dawn Hebron <HebronD@api.org>
From: Catherine Beatty <matheny@postoffice.pacbell.net>
Cc: 'carol.a.fairbrother@exxonmobil.com' <carol.a.fairbrother@exxonmobil.com>;
'Broddle, William' <bill.d.broddle@usa.conoco.com>; 'burnetdm@bp.com' <burnetdm@bp.com>; Tsai, Shan
SP SHLOIL-SPS <sptsai@shell.com>; Cagen, Stuart Z SCC <szcagen@Shell.Com>; Lorraine Twerdok
<twerdoki@api.org>; George Woodall <Woodallg@api.org>; 'Patrick Beatty(Home)' <matheny@pacbell.net>
Bcc:
Sent Date: 2001-07-23 07:54:11 GMT
Subject: Re: Benzene Technical Committee teleconference

As you all have probably noticed, the note from me that was attached to the conference call notification was truncated at the point of listing possible candidates for the Scientific Review Panel. Because of a glitch in my machine here at home, I lost the last portion of the note when I attempted to send it. (I had saved up to that point.) By that time I had neither the time nor the inclination to redo that last section.

For those of you who check their e-mail first thing in the morning, here is a reconstruction of what I intended to send.

Nominees:

Epidemiology - Nancy Mueller (Harvard) - A specialist in epi of lymphomas and NHL. One of the original reviewers. Made strong contribution to the review at that time.

- _____ Millikan (U. North Carolina) - I don't remember his first name. Rob Schnatter identified him. Originally a Ph.D. in Biochemistry/Molecular biology with subsequent return to school for Public Health degree. Would be useful reviewer of Molecular Epi and epi aspects of the Disease Progression study.
- Martha Linet (NCI) - She was part of the original NCI team in China, but seems to be more objective about their work than Hayes or Rothman. My understanding is that she has left that project. Her presence on the Panel would bring significant credibility.

Industrial Hygiene/

Exposure Assessment - Robert Herrick (Harvard) - My top choice. Extensive experience and credentials. Credibility as former NIOSH administrator. Has consulted as reviewer for an EMBSI study.

aligned

Robert Harris (U. North Carolina) - Lots of experience. Participated in early Pliofilm work. Not sure if he is retired. Recommended by Dennis Paustenbach as non-aligned and respected

Neil Zimmerman (Purdue) - Second tier name from Paustenbach. Younger than the 2 above. Experience with occupational epi and solvents.

Steve Rappaport (U North Carolina) - This one is controversial. He has published on benzene-related hydroquinone adducts to protein. He has one paper arguing that the benzene PEL is not protective for workers. Paustenbach says that he disagrees with PEL development process in general and used benzene as an example, but that he

would be an objective reviewer. Biggest value is his credibility with regulatory agencies and NGOs. Rob Schnatter says that he is a perfectionist, critical of everyone's work including his own.

Lance Wallace (USEPA Ret'd) - NOT an IH'er but well known name in exposure monitoring, although predominantly not occupational. Could meet the requirement for a regulatory representative

Annie Jarabek (USEPA) - Not sure of her training, but has published many papers on risk assessment from the exposure assessment direction. Tony Cox said that she is as close to apolitical as you will find in EPA. Currently on sabbatical at CIIT.

Statistics/Study Design - Louise Ryan (Harvard) - Mentioned by Tony Cox. Experience with clinical studies. She has been on advisory boards for NTP and EPA as well as NAS committees. Fellow of the American Statistical Society. She is a coauthor on a couple studies of reproductive effects of benzene/solvent exposure in China.

don't Nicholas Jewell (UC Berkeley) - Another Tony Cox suggestion as non-aligned. I have a lot of info on him other than he does work with epi studies including diseases.

Kenneth Kopecky (U Washington/Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center) - Recommended by Richard Larson (See below). Extensive bibliography on AML, both clinical trials and basic research. Involved in epi studies of radiation effects in Hanford WA and Chernobyl.

Hematology - Richard Larson (U. Chicago) - Clinical Hematologist/Oncologist. Participated in Ottawa Conference and on previous review of China protocols. He was very useful in that first review. Good solid reputation. I would like to keep him.

Mark Minden (Ontario Cancer Institute) - Molecular hematologist. Publications in area of leukemia progression and molecular biology of leukemia (especially AML) induction and regulation. Could be an excellent person to review the disease progression study.

Hematopathology - James Brunning (U Minn.) - Recommended by Larson. Currently emeritus professor, but active. Involved in recent WHO reclassification of MDS. The two really big names, John Bennett and Harold Vardiman are wanted by Irons for a pathology working group to review tissue slides as needed.

Genetic Toxicology - Richard Albertini (U. Vermont) - Big name in genetic biomarkers. Participated in Butadiene study of Czech workers. Participant in initial review of China protocols. Was not a strong participant. Will participate in 2nd review upcoming.

I would really like to have a 2nd candidate to discuss in this category.

General Biochemistry - Jerry Rice (IARC) - Rice is the head of the group in IARC which develops the Monographs. He has agreed to review the protocols and to participate on the ongoing

Panel. Having IARC participation is a very big score for the consortium. If we don't use him in this category, he should be added in a quasi regulatory slot. He is a keeper.

David Eastmond (UC Riverside) - Some will consider him controversial. He has consulted for USEPA and Cal/EPA on benzene. He takes a conservative stance on risk issues. However, this gives him great credibility with these agencies. He has published extensively on benzene and the research is well done. Rob Schnatter thinks he would be an objective, fair reviewer.

very Franz Oesch (Somewhere in Germany) - Suggested by Robert Snyder. Oesch is a big name in biochemical toxicology and metabolism. He would bring credibility in Europe.

in Donald Reed (Oregon State U.) - Former SOT president and Director of OSU Center Environmental Toxicology (NIEHS funded). Reed is very well known and respected in mechanistic toxicology and metabolism. He has not published on benzene but would be a good general reviewer. He does not have the specific credibilities with regulatory agencies, but would make a good candidate if the other two are not available or interested.

The above is what I have been able to dig up by making calls or doing research. I welcome other ideas as well.

Dawn Hebron wrote:

Our conference call has been scheduled for July 23rd at 11am EST. To be connected to the call please dial 703-736-7274 and ask to be connected to the call moderated by George Woodall of API. Your confirmation number for the call is 5411972. Below is a note from Patrick.

Technical Committee Members,

I apologize for the short lead time on this message, but other issues forced me to put this off longer than I wished.

One of the items that we need to discuss on our conference call is the size and composition of the Scientific Review Panel. I would like to send a consensus recommendation to the Oversight Committee at their July 26th meeting. Below I have penned (typed?) some of my thoughts. To use as a starting place for our consideration. If you have ideas for additional candidates, please bring them to the call or e-mail them prior if time allows. Most of the candidates have not been approached about participation at this time. I would like to prioritize 2 or 3 individuals for each slot on the Panel.

THE ISSUES: Size, Composition (Disciplines), Nominees

Size: Trying to balance between a Panel that is small enough to be workable and with a reasonable chance of getting a sizeable majority available at the same time for conference calls or meetings as needed versus having the right types of expertise (not to mention representation by regulatory bodies) is going to be quite a balancing

act. How is that for a run-on sentence? My preference is to try to limit it to 10 members if possible. I don't think that we can get away with fewer than that based on the expertise we need. See next issue. I also think that we should absolutely not go over 12.

Composition: Of the areas of expertise that I have identified (by no means all) three are so important in my mind as to require more than one Panel member. Those disciplines are epidemiology, hematology and industrial hygiene. My list is as follows:

Epidemiology - 2

Industrial Hygiene/Exposure Assessment - 2

Clinical Hematology/Oncology - 2

Hematopathology - 1

Statistics/Data Analysis - 1

Genetic Toxicology/Cytogenetics - 1

General Biochemical Toxicology/Metabolism -1

Other considerations include: need to have at least one US regulatory body included, credibility with agencies/NGOs, free from conflict of interest (as practicably as possible no history of industry funding or litigation), experience with occupational studies.

Nominees:
