

SRA Dose Response Speciality Group (DRSG)
Monthly Business Meeting Notes
April 6, 2004
3:30 - 4:30 pm EST

Members/Attendees: Peg Coleman, Gary Foureman (President), Lynne Haber, John Keller, Ralph Kodell (President-elect), John Lipscomb (past-President), Peter McClure (Secretary-Treasurer), Resha Putzrath, Reeder Sams, Paul Schlosser (Trustee), Patty Toccalino, Mike Zager (Vice-President)

ITEMS OF DISCUSSION

1. Announcements

The President will be absent at the May 4 meeting; the President-elect will preside.

The President was interviewed for a RISK Newsletter cover story which is now available in draft form. A copy of this draft has been made available to the Executive Committee to offer comment by the Editor's deadline of COB 12 April, 2004.

DRSG representation at the Planning Meeting (scheduled for 27 May in Washington, D.C.) will include Ron Brown and John K. All other interested DRSG members are encouraged to attend.

Peg C. inquired as to the HQ policy on allowing the specialty group to waive registration fee for invited nonmember speakers. Gary F. indicated he would clarify this with Lori Strong and communicate this back to those involved in session development.

Jonathan Wiener (Duke Law Center) has indicated that he plans to pursue the "adversity" project (see Jan and Feb DRSG notes) as a summer project.

2. Identification of Teleseminar Participants. Discussion among members present favored that teleseminar participants have the option of identifying themselves for the sake of the speaker and to promote the interaction and recognition among the membership. Paul, Ralph, and Peter offered to try and come up with a means of doing this, possibly via an RSVP that could be included in the next teleseminar announcement. They could report on this at the next business meeting, May 4, 2004.

3. Announcement of DRSG Student Award. Mike Z. reported on his entry on the DRSG student award in the national call for papers. The entry follows:

Student Merit Award in Dose-Response Assessment The Dose-Response Specialty Group (DRSG) sponsors a student award for application towards expenses encountered as part of attending the SRA's Annual Meeting. All abstracts must be submitted for presentation at the annual SRA meeting in Palm Springs by May 14 following normal SRA guidelines for abstract submission (www.sra.org for meeting dates, guidelines and deadlines). On the web site submission form, please choose "Student Merit Award in Dose Response Assessment" in addition to a subject category. An additional submission to the DRSG should be made in the form of a 1-2 page extended abstract. The deadline for submission to the DRSG is May 18, 2004.

Format and content of the abstracts are at the discretion of submitters. Please submit 2 copies of abstracts to Michael Zager, U. S. EPA, Mail Drop B143-01, Research Triangle Park, NC, 27711, 919-541-0125, FAX: 919-541-4284, E-mail: zager.mike@epa.gov Abstracts are judged on the basis of soundness, complexity and contribution to the field. A check is presented to the award winner; in the past, funds have also been available to recognize runners-up.

4. Discussion of Proposed Scientific Sessions The principal action item here is to prepare or oversee as completely as possible the preparation of the sessions listed below to meet requirements and deadlines set by SRA HQ (below). Progress in this action item will be the principal focus of the May business meeting.

It was agreed that session organizers should circulate proposals via email prior to the May 4 teleconference. Circulated information should include Session Title, Descriptive Paragraph, List of Presenters and Titles. Abstracts would be helpful, if available.

Instructions for Submitting Session Proposals. According to HQ, proposed sessions have to be submitted as complete packages under the same deadline for abstracts, May 14, 2004.

A “complete package” includes: the title of the proposed session, a descriptive paragraph on the purpose and scope of the session, a list of session presenters, the titles of their presentations as well as the abstracts themselves. A typical session is 4 presentations.

Discussion of the various proposed sessions (and responsible proponents) in regard to the likelihood of developing a “complete package” followed:

Development of dosimetry models for pregnant females and developing fetuses (Greg Blumenthal). indicated he would communicate with Greg concerning the progress in developing this session.

Dose-response and prediction of risk in mixtures (Ralph K., John L., Linda Teuschler)
COMMENTARY: This session also continued to be endorsed. Ralph indicated real progress had been made towards creating a package.

Modeling of toxicodynamic responses (Paul S.)
COMMENTARY: A word of caution concerning this session was that it should address issues of risk rather than discussing model development and description. Paul indicated a few speakers had been identified.

Methods for characterizing the variability in toxicity testing (Jim Wilson)
COMMENTARY: As no proponents were forthcoming for this proposal, it was not discussed further.

Microbial risk assessment (Peg C., John L. and Linda Teuschler)
COMMENTARY: It was suggested that a Homeland Security aspect be included in the development of this session. Peg and John indicated this session was already in an advanced stage of development.

Chemical-specific adjustments in dose-response assessments (John L. & Gary F.)
COMMENTARY: There was a consensus for endorsement of such a session. Gary F. and John L. agreed to work and apply further thought to this potential session.

IRIS as a risk science institution (Amy Mills & Gary F.)

COMMENTARY: This proposal (received from IRIS) was endorsed by those present, and projected as a likely poster-platform session. Gary indicated that he would work with IRIS in the development of such a session.

The role of mechanistic data in naphthalene toxicity (Cynthia Mann, Exxon)

COMMENTARY: Lynn H. was asked by Cynthia Mann to bring this before the SRSG, but the proposal was not fully discussed adequately by the group. Phone discussions among executive members about this proposal will follow before a decision to endorse this proposal will be made.