DRSG telemeeting minutes: March 03, 2015

Present: Kan Shao (Chair), Allen Davis (Chair-elect), Weihsueh Chiu (Trustee-at-Large), Julie Fitzpatrick, Patty Toccalino, Paul Schlosser, Sarah Kobylewski (Vice-Chair), Mike Musso, Resha Putzrath, Jeff Gift, Peg Coleman, Julia Pletz (Secretary/Treasurer)

1. Approve minutes from February 3, 2015 business meeting.
Available at: http://www.sra.org/sites/default/files/u35/Minutes_02-03-15.pdf (All)
Minutes of the February meeting were approved.

2. Update on 2015 DRSG Teleseminar planning (Allen and all)
Allen reported that Dr. Goldstein has confirmed his willingness to contribute. Dr. Rosalind Wright responded that she would be willing to speak on dose-response of psychosocial stressors at the seminar in September. Allen is still waiting for a response from Dr. Krewski whether or not he could give two related presentations: 1) the development of the JMED (joint model for excess and deficiency) model, and 2) extending categorical regression modeling with population data on interindividual variability for the purposes of risk management decisions. He will be waiting for his feedback until the end of this week. If he does not reply, Allen plans on approaching Dr. Krewski’s student who was working on the project. Julie Fitzpatrick mentioned that his assistant is usually the point of contact

If anyone has any further suggestions for alternative topics and presenters, Jeff will be open for suggestions.

This year, four seminars are planned: two have been scheduled and confirmed so far; feedback is pending from Daniel Krewski (on Joint Model for Excess and Deficiency on copper) and the 4th presentation planned is on integration on population-based data, variation within a population by Dale Hattis.

3. Update on student award submission elicitation (Sarah and all)
Sarah reported that her preparations for communicating the student award are going well. The poster was sent out and the announcement is on the DRSG website. Sarah has contacted UCLA, and is also in contact with other specialty groups, and Tanisha Welsh from AAAS who might post the award announcement on the AAAS website.

Kan mentioned that SOT is taking place in the last week of this month and asked whether it will be possible to put up the flyer at SOT. Sarah commented that she will not be able to attend but one of her friends will participate and see if she can get the flyer up there. Paul said he will attend and will put up some flyers on biological modelling. He said he could also put up some of the award flyers.

4. Treasury report (Julia)
Julia said that the report she received from Nguyen reflects the group’s financial status of December 31, 2014. The report will be updated quarterly so the next update will be for the end of this month. Julia said she will check with Nguyen whether we can already have access to the next report in the beginning of April.

For the period from April 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014, the group’s beginning balance was $9,973.20 and income dues of $660 were noted. Total expenses of $1,784.30 were accrued for 2014 Annual Meeting Travel expenses for Patty Toccalino, Sara Henry and Chitrada Kaweteerawa and iPrint Promotion which leaves an ending balance of $8,848.90. Some Annual Meeting expenses have not yet been accounted for.

5. Discuss possible symposium topics for SRA 2015 (All)
Kan said that Michelle asked whether someone would be willing to help her with organizing the agenda for a joint symposium of SRA’s Occupational Health and Safety group with DRSG. Michelle will still lead the project. Julia mentioned that she would be happy to help out and see whether any input from Novartis was
welcome and possible. Kan will establish the contact between Michelle and Julia.

Paul proposed to have a meeting on uncertainty factors, based around a published debate (two papers) by Adam Finkel and Ken Bogen in a recent issue of the *Risk Analysis*. Mike said that Adam Finkel and Ken Bogen from Exponent would most likely be interested in contributing to this topic. Paul confirmed that as he has been in touch with Adam Finkel and knows that he would generally be interested in participating. A roundtable discussion might be a good format for this. Mike offered to contact Ken Bogen.

Julie explained briefly the steps of how to organize a symposium. A Chair is needed and four speakers for one session. The chair would apply for the symposium code and at a later stage the participants use that code when submitting their abstracts.

Peg Coleman proposed a symposium on an aspect of microbial risk assessment which is usually rarely discussed, modelling immunity, in a joint symposium with the Microbial Risk Analysis group. Immunity and related heterogeneity are usually not included in modelling approaches. Resha would be interested in such a symposium. She highlighted the draft guidance for immunotoxicity risk assessment that was published by IPCS a few years ago and that there is a lot of potential for a useful discussion. Kan agreed that it would be a good idea to have a joint symposium with Microbial Risk Analysis group. Peg agreed on leading the work on the symposium and Resha agreed on helping Peg.

Kan asked Jeff whether a symposium on arsenic would be possible. Jeff would have to ask two other colleagues to assess whether this would be possible or too premature. Jeff asked whether there was a specific aspect that should be focussed on, a particular endpoint or modelling approach? It might be good to focus on a particular modelling approach, potentially model averaging. Resha mentioned excess modelling. She said it might be interesting to explore one most important difference and why, discuss the selection of the model or the selection of the control population for the most accurate analysis for arsenic exposure. According to Jeff, this could still be endpoint-specific so the endpoint would need to be clarified. Kan asked about the major factor of uncertainty. Resha replied that there are lots of factors to improve a risk assessment, and that it could be examined how much a factor matters for a dose-response analysis. Jeff added that a number of sensitivity analyses will be done in future.

Weihsueh proposed to include other examples apart from arsenic. Resha mentioned the issue of different people having different views on what the important factors in an assessment are - arsenic could be used as example to explore this. Weihsueh raised that DRSG might not be the right platform for that kind of discussion. Jeff added that an approval would be needed if arsenic would be focussed on. Looking at EPA’s arsenic timeline, at the time of SRA meeting the draft will most likely be in the public comment period. Jeff asked Kan to put together his ideas in writing so that he can discuss this with his colleagues. Kan added that a proposal for a symposium should be submitted in May.

**6. Update on potential communication method (Kan)**

No further progress was made on this matter. Kan will test an alternative method with Paul and Julie in the following week.

**7. Other items?**

None.