Message

From: Pamela J Lein [pjlein@ucdavis.edu]
Sent: 8/5/2017 11:39:29 AM
To: Lehmann, Geniece [Lehmann.Geniece@epa.gov]; pradeep.rajan@ Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) sagiv@berkeley.edu
CC: Trgovcich, Joanne [Joanne.Trgovcich@icfi.com]; Carlson, Laura [Carlson.Laura@epa.gov]; Burch, Dave [dave.burch@icf.com]
Subject: RE: Revised PECO Statement - neurological effects

I will completed step 1 by close of business on Monday Aug 7.

Pam

-----Original Message-----
From: Lehmann, Geniece [mailto:Lehmann.Geniece@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, August 04, 2017 6:34 PM
To: pradeep.rajan@ Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) sagiv@berkeley.edu; Pamela J Lein <pjlein@ucdavis.edu>
Cc: Trgovcich, Joanne <Joanne.Trgovcich@icfi.com>; Carlson, Laura <Carlson.Laura@epa.gov>; Burch, Dave <dave.burch@icf.com>
Subject: RE: Revised PECO Statement - neurological effects

Thanks, Pradeep (and Sharon).

This looks good - I don't have much of anything to say about the document right now because I suspect that some of your decisions will evolve as you fold in the information from the animal database.

The next steps are (1) for Pam to fill out the animal portion of the PECO statement, and (2) for the three of you to decide which outcomes are the highest priority for systematic review and which are lower priority.

That 2nd step can be challenging, so I'll just ask you to please try to keep in mind that we do not have unlimited resources with which to conduct these systematic reviews, and that neurological effects are not the only effects we need to evaluate for PCBs (although, with that said, they are among the most important, and because of that, you'll get a bit more latitude than other health effect sections).

There are two overarching goals of the neurological effects section of the IRIS assessment. The first goal is to find out if we are able to establish a link between PCB exposure and neurological effects. If that can be done with a systematic review of only one neurological effect, then that's all that's needed for hazard id. The second goal is to be able to develop reference values. For that, we want to be sure that we're capturing the most impactful and most sensitive outcomes, so that's why we'd want to do systematic reviews of those. But, reviewing outcomes beyond what we need for hazard id and dose-response assessment only uses time and resources that could be better spent on another health outcome or another assessment. In light of this, I encourage you to consider lowering the priority of some of the outcome categories if you're skeptical about how useful they'll be for supporting hazard id or the development of reference values. There should be plenty of information in the stronger databases to get the job done.

Please let me know when you think you'll be able to complete steps 1 and 2 as described above.

Thanks,
Geniece

Geniece M. Lehmann, Ph.D.
Toxicologist
National Center for Environmental Assessment Office of Research & Development U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, B243-01 RTP, NC 27711

Phone: 919-541-2289
Fax: 919-541-0245

Notice (If This Communication Regards a Contract): Nothing in this message shall be construed as a change to the price, schedule, or terms and conditions of the contract. If the receiver does construe it otherwise, please notify me or the contracting officer immediately so that proper contract action can be initiated.

-----Original Message-----
From: Pradeep Rajan [mailto:pradeep.rajan Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Sent: Friday, August 04, 2017 2:53 PM
To: Lehmann, Geniece <Lehmann.Geniece@epa.gov>
Cc: sagiv@berkeley.edu; Trgovcich, Joanne <Joanne.Trgovcich@icfi.com>; Pamela Lein <pjlein@ucdavis.edu>
Subject: Revised PECO Statement - neurological effects

Hi Geniece,

Please find attached our revised PECO statement for neurological effects (human evidence).

Look forward to hearing your thoughts on our revisions, as well as next steps for our section.

Thanks,

Pradeep

Pradeep Rajan, ScD
President
Pradeep Rajan LLC
phone: 919-888-1130
pradeep.rajan@ Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)