



## In This Issue

<a href="#">IC2 News</a> .....	1
<a href="#">News from the U.S. EPA</a> .....	2
<a href="#">State Updates</a> .....	4

## IC2 News

### Chemical Hazard Assessment Database

The IC2 announces the launch of a new online resource, called the [Chemical Hazard Assessment Database](#) that enables users to search for [GreenScreen™](#) and [Quick Chemical Assessment Tool](#) (QCAT) assessments. The purpose of this database is to promote awareness of assessments conducted on chemicals of high concern, facilitate transparency and discussion, and reduce duplication of effort. It provides summary profiles for chemicals of high concern and in some cases available alternatives. Users can search by CAS number or chemical name.

[Clean Production Action](#) created the GreenScreen™ for Safer Chemicals (GS) to help with evaluating chemicals and their potential degradation products against a range of toxicity, environmental fate, and physical/chemical endpoints. Chemicals receive a combined "benchmark score" based upon the assessments of [19 hazard endpoints](#). The GS places each chemical along a continuum of concern and assigns them one of four possible benchmarks. The result of this process enables users to compare priority chemicals and their potential alternatives using a consistent and common template.

Because of the significant degree of technical knowledge and resources required by users of the GS, the Washington Department of Ecology

developed a simplified version, called the Quick Chemical Assessment Tool (QCAT). The primary goal of the QCAT is to assign an appropriate grade for a chemical using a subset of high priority hazard endpoints identified in the GS that requires fewer data sources. This tool can be used to screen chemicals to ascertain whether a more in-depth GS assessment is necessary and to provide an approximation of the potential concerns associated with a chemical based upon limited data. To help users understand the differences between GS and QCAT, the Database provides a profile of the end points that each of them covers.

The IC2 is making GS and QCAT assessments available as a service to its membership and user community. The IC2 and its members review the submitters of the assessments and determine whether they are qualified to conduct this kind of analysis. However, the IC2, NEWMOA, and their members have not verified the results of the assessments and are not responsible for their content. The assessments do not necessarily reflect the views of the IC2, NEWMOA, or the member states. Mention of any company, process, or product name should not be considered an endorsement by the IC2, NEWMOA, or the membership. These assessments are not designed to assess risk or substitute for a risk assessment since they do not evaluate exposure.

## Membership Invitation

The IC2 invites businesses, non-governmental organizations, academic researchers, consultants, and others to join the Clearinghouse. Supporting Members sign a Memorandum of Agreement demonstrating support for the principles of the Clearinghouse and provide annual dues to help fund baseline activities. All IC2 Supporting Members are eligible to participate in the [IC2 Council](#) and in [IC2 Workgroups](#). For more information, visit: [www.newmoa.org/prevention/ic2/membership.cfm](http://www.newmoa.org/prevention/ic2/membership.cfm); or contact: Adam Wienert, (617) 367-8558 x307, [awienert@newmoa.org](mailto:awienert@newmoa.org).

## **States Seek Input on Draft Guidance for Assessing Alternatives to Toxic Chemicals**

The IC2 announced the availability of [draft guidance on alternatives assessment and chemical risk reduction](#) in early March. The document is available for public review and comment through May 3, 2013.

The IC2 sponsored the creation of an alternatives assessment (AA) Guidance that is flexible enough to meet a wide range of user needs, including small, medium, and large businesses, local, state, and federal governments and other interested parties. The goals/objectives are to:

- Reduce risk by replacing toxic chemicals in products with safer alternatives;
- Include all reasonable criteria to be addressed in an alternative assessment including hazard, exposure, process engineering, price and availability, others;
- Define the minimum amount of information needed to conduct an alternative assessment; and
- Include sufficient flexibility that potential users can define what comprises an alternative assessment. This encompasses both which criteria to use and to what depth each criterion is evaluated.

The draft guidance is based on an alternatives assessment process pioneered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Design for the Environment Program. The IC2 AA Guidance document enables members to standardize their alternatives assessment process, potentially allowing states with similar interests to share AA results.

The Guidance does not provide a single, specific methodology for conducting an AA. Instead, it presents three decision-making frameworks used in related processes. Up to ten modules, each evaluating a different aspect of potential alternatives, can be "plugged into" the chosen framework. Each module can be completed at different levels. Higher levels require greater expertise and resources, but afford the user greater confidence in the results. Users choose a framework, modules, and levels within modules to create an AA appropriate to the chemical, product, or process under assessment.

"As more states consider incorporating alternatives analyses requirements in their laws and regulations, this effort by IC2 to gather input from all potentially-affected stakeholders is important," said Maureen Gorsen, Partner at Alston and Bird, and supporting member of the IC2. "This is a brand new area of law, and it is critical that good guidance be established."

## **Chemical Use Disclosure Initiative**

For a number of years, companies, and advocates have been calling for greater transparency in the information available on the use of chemicals in products. In response, some state environmental agencies have begun to require reporting on chemical use in certain products and to publish the available data. The IC2 held a "Chemical Use Disclosure" webinar on February 25, 2013 to kick-off a series of discussions designed to help shape the future of these information resources. It featured presentations on:

- The newly released Washington Department of Ecology [online system](#) for searching for information collected from manufacturers on the use of about 60 chemicals of high concern in children's products; and
- The Interstate Mercury Education and Reduction Clearinghouse (IMERC) [online database](#) covering the intentional use of mercury in products.

The IC2 has posted a [PDF version of the presentation](#) and made a video of the webinar and follow-up discussion available on [NEWMOA's YouTube channel](#).

This initiative is made possible with funding support from the [John Merck Fund](#) and participation from the [BizNGO Network](#) and the [GC3](#).

## **News from the U.S. EPA**

### **EPA Bans 12 D-Con Mouse & Rat Control Products**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is moving to ban the sale of 12 D-Con mouse and rat poison products produced by Reckitt Benckiser Inc. because these products fail to comply with current EPA safety standards. Approximately 10,000 children a year are accidentally exposed to mouse and rat baits; EPA has worked cooperatively with companies to ensure that products are both safe to use around children and effective for consumers. Reckitt Benckiser Inc., maker of D-Con brand products, is the only rodenticide producer that has refused to adopt EPA's safety standards for all of its consumer use products.

The Agency has worked with a number of companies during the last five years to develop safer rodent control products that are effective, affordable, and widely available to meet the needs of consumers.

*Continued on next page...*

Examples of products meeting EPA safety standards include Bell Laboratories' Tomcat products, PM Resources' Assault brand products and Chemsico's products.

The EPA requires rodenticide products for consumer use to be contained in protective tamper-resistant bait stations and prohibits pellets and other bait forms that cannot be secured in bait stations. In addition, the EPA prohibits the sale to residential consumers of products containing brodifacoum, bromadiolone, difethialone, and difenacoum because of their toxicity to wildlife.

For companies that have complied with the new standards in 2011, EPA has received no reports of children being exposed to bait contained in bait stations. EPA expects to see a substantial reduction in exposures to children when the 12 D-Con products that do not comply with current standards are removed from the consumer market as millions of households use these products each year.

For more information visit: [www.epa.gov/pesticides/controlling/rodents.htm](http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/controlling/rodents.htm)

### **EPA Releases New Report on Children's Health and the Environment**

In January, EPA released "America's Children and the Environment, Third Edition," a comprehensive compilation of information from a variety of sources on children's health and the environment. The Report shows trends for contaminants in air, water, food, and soil that may affect children; concentrations of contaminants in the bodies of children and women of child-bearing age; and childhood illnesses and health conditions.

## IC2 E-Bulletin

The Interstate Chemicals Clearinghouse (IC2) is an association of state, local, and tribal governments that promotes a clean environment, healthy communities, and a vital economy through the development and use of safer chemicals and products. The purpose of the *IC2 E-bulletin* is to keep IC2 Members and Supporting Members and others informed about the activities of the Clearinghouse, its members, and related national and international programs. Funding for the *E-Bulletin* is provided by the IC2 membership. The *E-Bulletin* is produced by NEWMOA, which provides staff and other support for the IC2. Previous issues are available at: [www.newmoa.org/prevention/ic2/pubs/](http://www.newmoa.org/prevention/ic2/pubs/).

Among the contaminants clearly linked to health conditions in children, key findings include:

- The median concentration of lead in the blood of children between the ages of 1 and 5 years was 92 percent lower in 2009-2010 compared to 1976-1980 levels. Although the majority of the decline occurred in the 1980s, consistent decreases have continued since 1999.
- The median level of cotinine (a marker of exposure to environmental tobacco smoke) measured in blood of nonsmoking children ages 3 to 17 years was 88 percent lower in 2009-2010 than it was in 1988-1991. In 2010, 6 percent of children ages 0 to 6 years lived in homes where someone smoked regularly, compared with 27 percent in 1994.
- The percentage of children living in counties where pollutant concentrations were above the levels of one or more national air quality standards declined from 75 percent to 59 percent from 1999 to 2009.

The level of knowledge regarding the relationship between environmental exposures and health outcomes varies widely among the topics presented in this Report, and the inclusion of an indicator in the Report does not necessarily imply a known relationship between environmental exposure and children's health effects. The Report provides data for selected children's health conditions that warrant further research because the causes, including possible contributing environmental factors, are complex and not well understood at this point.

The national indicators presented in this comprehensive Report are important for informing future research related to children's health. Children may be more vulnerable to environmental exposures than adults because children's bodies are still developing. Children eat more, drink more, and breathe more in proportion to their body size; and their behavior can expose them more to chemicals and organisms.

This Report includes 37 indicators of children's environmental health to address 23 important topics. The expanded content reflects the latest research on children's health issues and the availability of data for more topics. Each indicator and its supporting text were peer reviewed by independent external experts and made available for review and comment by the public.

More on "America's Children and the Environment, Third Edition": [www.epa.gov/ace/](http://www.epa.gov/ace/).

## **EPA Releases Draft Risk Assessments**

In January, EPA released for public comment draft risk assessments, for particular uses, on five chemicals found in common household products. The draft risk assessments were developed as part of the agency's Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) Work Plan, which identified common chemicals for review over the coming years to assess any impacts on people's health and the environment. Following public comment, the Agency will seek an independent, scientific peer review of the assessments before beginning to finalize them in the fall of 2013.

The five assessments address the following chemical uses: methylene chloride or dichloromethane (DCM) and n-methylpyrrolidone (NMP) in paint stripper products; trichloroethylene (TCE) as a degreaser and a spray-on protective coating; antimony trioxide (ATO) as a synergist in halogenated flame retardants; and 1,3,4,6,7,8-Hexahydro-4,6,6,7,8,8-hexamethylcyclopenta-[ $\gamma$ ]-2-benzopyran (HHCB) as a fragrance ingredient in commercial and consumer products. The draft assessments focus either on human health or ecological hazards for specific uses, which are subject to regulation under TSCA. Three of the draft risk assessments— DCM, NMP, and TCE— indicate a potential concern for human health under specific exposure scenarios for particular uses. The preliminary assessments for ATO and HHCB indicate a low concern for ecological health.

EPA recommends the public follow product label directions and take precautions that can reduce exposures, such as using the product outside or in an extremely well-ventilated area and wearing protective equipment to reduce exposure. If EPA concludes in finalizing the risk assessments that there is a potential for concern, the Agency will take action as appropriate to address possible risks.

Additional information can be found at: [www.epa.gov/oppt/existingchemicals/pubs/workplans.html](http://www.epa.gov/oppt/existingchemicals/pubs/workplans.html)

## State Updates

### **California DTSC**

In January 2013, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) issued a [revised set of regulations](#) outlining how they plan to implement the Safer Consumer Products requirements. The revisions specify the process for:

- Identifying chemicals and prioritizing Priority Products and their Chemicals of Concern; and
- Identifying and analyzing alternatives to consider for Priority Products to determine how best to eliminate or reduce potential exposures to, or the level of potential adverse impacts posed by, the Chemical(s) of Concern in the Priority Products.

The proposed rule covers the:

- Process for identifying candidate chemicals;
- Process for identifying and prioritizing product-chemical combinations;
- Petition process for identification and prioritization of chemicals and products;
- Alternatives analysis;
- Regulatory responses;
- Dispute resolution processes; and
- Audits.

For more information, including comments received during the public comment period that ended on February 28, 2013 visit: [DTSC Safer Consumer Products Regulations](#).

### **Washington DoE**

In February 2012, the second phase of manufacturer reporting to Washington Department of Ecology on products containing at least one of the 66 chemicals on the [Children's Safe Products Act](#) reporting list was completed. Over 5,000 records have been entered into Ecology's [online reporting system](#) during the first two reporting phases.

Ecology is continuing its work on [new rulemaking](#) in response to a petition to add tris (1,3-dichloro-2-propyl) phosphate ([TDCPP](#)) (CAS # 13674-87-8) to the list of Chemicals of High Concern to Children. The Agency expects to release proposed rule text for public comment on May 1, 2013.

For more information, visit [www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/swfa/cspa/](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/swfa/cspa/).