

MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
AIR RESOURCES BOARD
SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH
KORN MEETING ROOM 16-035-CHS
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
650 CHARLES E. YOUNG DRIVE, SOUTH
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

AND

UCSF LIBRARY
PARNASSUS CAMPUS, SUITE 366
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO
530 PARNASSUS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 2009

9:51 A.M.

LINDA KAY RIGEL, CSR
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 13196

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES

PANEL MEMBERS

(Appearance in Los Angeles:)

Dr. John Froines, Chairperson

Dr. Craig Byus

Dr. Joseph Landolph

(Appearance in San Francisco:)

Dr. Paul Blanc

Dr. Gary Friedman

Dr. Stanton Glantz

Dr. Charles Plopper

REPRESENTING THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD:

Mr. Jim Behrmann, Liaison

Mr. Peter Mathews

REPRESENTING THE OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD
ASSESSMENT

Dr. Melanie Marty, Chief, Air Toxicology and
Epidemiology Section

Dr. Andrew Salmon, Chief, Air Toxicology and Risk
Assessment Section

Dr. Martha S. Sandy, Chief, Cancer Toxicology and
Epidemiology Section, Reproductive and Cancer Hazard
Assessment Branch

I N D E X

--o0o--

	Page
Call to Order and Roll Call	1
1 Motion to approve Technical Support Document For Cancer Potency Factors, April 2009 and discussion	2
Vote on the motion	4
2 Discussion of draft findings for the report "Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Technical Support Document for the Derivation of Noncancer Reference Exposure Levels" (December 2008)	5
Motion and second	23
Vote on the motion	25
Adjournment	27
Certificate of Reporter	28

--o0o--

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 --o0o--

3 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: We can start now.

4 It's my view of this -- and people should
5 comment -- that I sent, through Jim, findings, some of
6 which had already been approved, to the panel about a
7 week or week and a half ago asking for comments so we
8 could bring this matter to closure today.

9 And so I'm assuming that people may or may not
10 have brought comments which can be incorporated into
11 the draft document. And if they -- so we need to
12 address any comments panel members have with respect to
13 the draft document.

14 But otherwise, we should proceed to bring this
15 to closure.

16 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: John, as a procedural
17 matter, can you just have a roll call so that the
18 minutes will reflect who is in attendance by telephone?

19 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Yes.

20 I am John Froines, and I chair this Scientific
21 Review Panel.

22 PANEL MEMBER LANDOLPH: Joe Landolph, member
23 of SRP.

24 PANEL MEMBER BYUS: Craig Byus, member of SRP.

25 PANEL MEMBER PLOPPER: Charlie Plopper, member

1 of SRP.

2 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Paul Blanc, SRP.

3 PANEL MEMBER FRIEDMAN: Gary Friedman, SRP.

4 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Stan Glantz, SRP.

5 MR. BEHRMANN: Everybody I think in the room
6 should introduce themselves.

7 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: No, that's not necessary.

8 PANEL MEMBER FRIEDMAN: But they should know
9 that there are other people in the room who are
10 visiting.

11 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Okay, John.

12 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Okay.

13 So the agenda for today is to discuss any
14 changes people had to the findings that were sent
15 around two weeks ago.

16 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Don't we first have to
17 approve the report? We never approved the report.

18 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: We approved parts of the
19 report. So why don't we have a motion to approve the
20 entire report?

21 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: I so move.

22 PANEL MEMBER FRIEDMAN: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Is there any discussion?

24 We're basically -- I think we should name the
25 report.

1 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. It's the
2 Technical Support Document For Cancer Potency Factors,
3 April 2009.

4 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: The other report that
5 we've already approved is the findings of the
6 Scientific Review Panel on noncancer exposure levels
7 for acrolein, acetaldehyde, arsenic, formaldehyde,
8 manganese, and mercury.

9 And they have been approved.

10 And we have the findings of the Scientific
11 Review Panel on the Technical Support Document, says
12 Derivation of Noncancer Reference Exposure Levels.

13 So there are three documents that basically
14 overall require our support. And I'm assuming that the
15 motion that it sounded like Stan made covers all three.

16 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Is there any
18 disagreement on that?

19 (No response)

20 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Hearing no disagreement,
21 I'm assuming that the vote we're about to take is a
22 vote on all three documents.

23 (No response)

24 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: It's very strange to get
25 total silence.

1 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. Yes, we agree.

2 Call the question.

3 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: All right. We'll call
4 the question.

5 All those in favor?

6 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Maybe you should do a
7 roll call.

8 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Why don't we do a roll
9 call. We'll start here. Craig?

10 PANEL MEMBER BYUS: Yes.

11 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Joe?

12 PANEL MEMBER LANDOLPH: Yes.

13 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Why don't you name
14 yourselves in San Francisco?

15 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Stan, yes.

16 PANEL MEMBER FRIEDMAN: Gary, yes.

17 PANEL MEMBER PLOPPER: Charlie, yes.

18 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Paul Blanc, yes.

19 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Okay. So that --

20 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: John, you have to say
21 that you say yes or no.

22 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: John Froines; I vote
23 yes.

24 And that means that we have formally approved
25 the three documents brought to us by OEHHA.

1 Now we can turn to our findings. And we need
2 to know: Are there -- we hoped to get comments from
3 people before this meeting, but that didn't happen.
4 And so the question then becomes: Are there changes or
5 modifications or recommendations that should be
6 incorporated into the document?

7 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Yeah, I have some. This
8 is Stan.

9 PANEL MEMBER FRIEDMAN: And I have a few minor
10 edits, which I don't think it's worth -- I'd just give
11 it to the staff. That should be sufficient. It
12 doesn't change any meaning at all.

13 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Okay.

14 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: First of all, I have to
15 say I have been traveling a lot, and I thought -- I
16 quickly looked at these and misread something, so -- or
17 I would have responded.

18 I think the part of the findings that says
19 Cancer Potency Factors document is really not
20 acceptable at all in its current form.

21 We've never had a findings where we said
22 Dr. Landolph stated, quote, I have read the document.
23 Or Dr. Glantz, you know, got a new pair of shoes.

24 So I think that whole paragraph should be
25 deleted, the first paragraph, Cancer Potency document.

1 The second paragraph, I have some suggested
2 edits on, which I'll get to in a minute, which I think
3 could lead to a consensus statement rather than a
4 minority report.

5 So I really would rather not have a minority
6 report. Paul is glaring at me, but I don't think
7 you'll object to it.

8 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Stan, I want to be clear
9 that Paul and I disagree with OEHHA.

10 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Well, just wait and
11 see -- give me a chance to -- listen to my suggested
12 language, okay?

13 But the other thing -- and this is something
14 that had been bouncing around months ago which I
15 thought was in here and wasn't and which I just got
16 from Melanie.

17 You know, normally in the findings we have
18 some bullet points summarizing the main points of the
19 document.

20 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Excuse me, but that's
21 not correct. This is not a Toxic Air Contaminant
22 document.

23 This a 2588, and all we have to do with this
24 document is tell Joan Denton that we have approved the
25 document. We don't need -- we do not need findings

1 like we have --

2 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. But the thing is,
3 John, if you're going to put in the point that you and
4 Paul disagree with the document on, then I think we
5 also need to put something else about what the document
6 says in.

7 And I think that can be reconciled, and so
8 just let me -- give me a chance to present what I'm
9 suggesting.

10 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Let me just say one
11 thing. I specifically sent out these documents two
12 weeks ago for people to give us input. And the idea
13 was so that we wouldn't have to have input at this
14 meeting.

15 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: I understand --

16 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Let me finish.

17 I think we should go ahead and hear your
18 comments; and if everybody agrees, we should
19 incorporated them.

20 But you'll have to do the incorporation, and
21 we will have to approve them, and then we'll insert
22 them if --

23 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Right.

24 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: -- at a later date.

25 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: That's fine. And maybe

1 we can fax this down to LA.

2 So -- this is an amended version of what
3 Melanie had given me some months ago. So I'm going to
4 just read it, and then I'm going to integrate your
5 thing as I read it, your second -- your slightly
6 modified -- well, let me tell you -- well, no. Okay.

7 So here's what I would read:

8 The procedures used to consider the
9 increased susceptibility of carcinogens
10 of infants and children compared to
11 adult include the use of age sensitivity
12 factors. These procedures will be used
13 to calculate risk for specified exposure
14 scenarios, taking into account the age
15 of the individual and exposure duration.
16 There is -- A: There is evidence to
17 suggest susceptibility to carcinogens is
18 often greater when exposure occurs at
19 earlier life stages due both to the
20 inherent sensitivity of these life
21 stages and the effect of a longer period
22 for the cancer to be manifest.
23 B: The use of age sensitivity factors
24 in calculating cancer risks from
25 exposures of infants, children, and

1 adolescents to reflect their anticipated
2 special sensitivity to carcinogens is
3 justified by the available evidence.

4 C: It appears that the sensitivity is
5 generally the greatest in infancy and
6 still elevated, but to a reduced extent,
7 during childhood and adolescence
8 relative to adults.

9 So I don't think any of that is controversial.
10 So this is the --

11 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Well, first of all, the
12 use of the word sensitivity instead of susceptibility
13 is probably not --

14 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay.

15 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: -- manifest.

16 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: I well accept changing
17 it to --

18 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: And secondly, I would
19 disagree with the use of the term "childhood" as
20 opposed to "infancy" because that's what the whole
21 argument is about, Stan.

22 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Well, just let me keep
23 going and see if you're happy with how --

24 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: All right. But I'm
25 disagreeing with your characterization that --

1 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay.

2 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: -- there is nothing in
3 what you said that anyone would agree with.

4 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. Okay.

5 So then, I would say -- and this is the thing
6 that the disagreement is over. I would say:

7 OEHHA recommends that these periods be
8 generally considered for humans to be
9 age 0 to less than 2 for infancy; 2 to
10 less than 16, child; and 16 to 70,
11 adult. The exact correspondence between
12 these time periods and ages in
13 experimental animals is not possible to
14 specify due to their different
15 developmental timetables.

16 Then I would take your second paragraph, and I
17 would delete the first sentence about two members of
18 the SRP and also the words "there only" and change it
19 to say:

20 There was some concern among the panel
21 with the selection of age bins for
22 humans.

23 And then just carry the whole -- put the whole
24 paragraph in, and then delete the last sentence about
25 this being a minority report.

1 So what this is saying is we're saying this is
2 what OEHHA recommends. There is some uncertainty. And
3 then to present the concerns that you raise here, just
4 saying there was some concern among members of the
5 panel.

6 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: First of all, I don't
7 object in general to what you're trying to do. It was
8 always our goal to try to achieve consensus.

9 My sense was that there was unwillingness on
10 the part of OEHHA to reach an interim midpoint
11 agreement.

12 And I'll just characterize the discussions
13 that way.

14 So the choices that I faced, as I saw it, was
15 either to oppose the document entirely or to agree to
16 some wording that would state the remaining questions
17 in the report.

18 I disagree with the wording which -- it
19 becomes a fait accompli when you said that OEHHA
20 designates infancy to be 0 to 2.

21 The argument was not whether infancy is 0 to
22 2. The argument was whether the age before the
23 step-down in susceptibility was 0 to 2. The issue was
24 not whether 0 to 2 is infancy.

25 So that has to be reworded; otherwise, it

1 makes us sound like --

2 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: No, that's fine.

3 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: It makes the opposition
4 sound like it's idiotic.

5 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: No, I don't have a
6 problem with that.

7 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Secondly, I object to the
8 term "some concern." There was real concern, not a
9 some concern, not a trivial concern. There was
10 concern.

11 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. I'm happy with
12 that.

13 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: And I would like -- and I
14 won't approve it until I see -- because we're in a
15 conference phone, and because I haven't seen the
16 wording, I'd like to see the wording circulated.

17 But assuming that those things are met, I have
18 no problem.

19 I do think that the first sentence of the
20 first paragraph, the cancer potency factors document
21 was reviewed extensively by the SRP, should stay.

22 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. I don't have any
23 problem with that.

24 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Stan?

25 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Yeah.

1 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: I would rather we finish
2 this document today if we possibly could for the
3 obvious -- can you -- can you take -- this sounds like
4 diesel again.

5 Can you take ten minutes and address the issue
6 Paul just raised?

7 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: I just handed it to Paul
8 for him to make the edits he would like.

9 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: So can we take a
10 ten-minute break?

11 AIR TOXICOLOGY AND EPIDEMIOLOGY BRANCH CHIEF
12 MARTY: It sounds like diesel, but it smells like tar
13 in here.

14 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Can somebody answer my
15 question?

16 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Paul is working on it
17 now.

18 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Shall we take a
19 ten-minute break then?

20 (Recess)

21 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Is the meeting
22 reconvened?

23 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Yes.

24 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay.

25 PANEL MEMBER FRIEDMAN: Let him finish the

1 point he wanted to put on the record.

2 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. Why don't you
3 deal with the arithmetic error?

4 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: John?

5 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Yes?

6 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: First deal with that
7 point, that we take into account that our approval of
8 the documents recognizes minor arithmetic changes on
9 two tables.

10 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Where is that written?

11 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: You just said it.

12 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: John, do you remember?
13 There are two arithmetic changes in the tables of the
14 document that do not change the content.

15 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Paul?

16 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Yeah.

17 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: That's fine. We don't
18 need to do anything because it's on the record, and
19 we're approving the document --

20 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: It had not been on the
21 record until I said it because we weren't in session
22 when we discussed it.

23 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Well, we are on the
24 record now, and so you make the sentence, and we will
25 incorporate it.

1 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay.

2 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Thank you.

3 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. So if you look at
4 the two pieces of paper you have --

5 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: We have three.

6 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Three. What's the third
7 piece?

8 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Okay. We had -- one
9 page got sent twice.

10 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. So if you look --
11 what the consolidated document should look like, if you
12 start out with the page that has number 1 at the top, 1
13 and then 2. So item number 1 you should delete.

14 So the only thing that's going to be --

15 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Does that mean delete
16 1A, B, C?

17 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: All of item 1 should be
18 deleted. Okay.

19 And then if you look at the other page, where
20 it -- the sentence: The cancer potency factors
21 document was reviewed extensively by the SRP, that --

22 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: We don't have that. We
23 don't have that page.

24 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: How could you not have
25 that page?

1 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: I'm sorry; we don't.

2 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: You have two pages.

3 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: One says arsenic,
4 formaldehyde, mercury, and manganese.

5 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Oh.

6 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Oh. Well, the one --
7 the other one is easy. Okay.

8 If you go to the findings that you circulated,
9 I will tell you the changes to make. Okay?

10 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Well --

11 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: No, it's very easy.
12 Just listen.

13 Find the page you distributed that says cancer
14 potency factors document. Page 4.

15 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: All right.

16 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. So it says cancer
17 potency factors document. Then it says: The cancer
18 potency factors document was reviewed extensively by
19 the SRP. Delete the rest of that paragraph.

20 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: All right.

21 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. Then in the next
22 paragraph, delete the first two sentences and change
23 to -- change "there only" to "there was," and then
24 delete --

25 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Wait, wait, wait.

1 Change what?

2 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. So the second
3 paragraph says: Two members of the SRP had an
4 alternate view, blah, blah, blah, and then it ends up
5 saying elegant and useful.

6 On the fourth line of the second paragraph.

7 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Yeah.

8 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Delete all of that.

9 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: So we're deleting the
10 first two sentences.

11 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Two sentences. And then
12 delete the words "there only." And --

13 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Where is there only?

14 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: The next two words after
15 what you deleted.

16 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Okay.

17 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: And insert the words
18 "there was." And then --

19 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Wait, wait.

20 It should be t-h-e-r-e.

21 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Right.

22 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Was.

23 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: There was.

24 And then "concern" stays. And then delete the
25 word "was" after the word "concern."

1 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: There were --

2 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: There was concern with
3 the selected age bins.

4 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: With the selected age
5 bins.

6 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. Then go down to
7 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 lines from the bottom.

8 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: But wait. The sentence
9 now reads: There was concern with the selected age
10 bins. And does the rest of that --

11 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Stays.

12 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: The rest of it stays.

13 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Wait, wait, wait.

14 Because the sentence then starts with: Was
15 with the selected age bins, so you've got --

16 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: No. There was concern
17 with the selected age bins.

18 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Concern with the selected
19 age bins.

20 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: The sentence reads:
21 There was concern with the selected age bins for
22 humans.

23 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Okay, good.

24 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. Then go to six
25 lines from the bottom, the line beginning: Assigning a

1 lower default cancer risk to children in a two-year --
2 in a two-year-old. And then delete the word "risk."

3 So it should just read: Two-year-old through
4 five-year-old range.

5 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Okay.

6 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Then go down to four
7 lines from the bottom. It says: This -- see where it
8 says this minority view as noted, blah, blah, blah.

9 Delete that line and then the words "presented
10 comma but" at the beginning of the next line.

11 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Presented comma but.

12 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Delete that.

13 Then capitalize "we" and delete the word "do."

14 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: So the final sentence,
15 John, reads:

16 We suggest that OEHHA consider this
17 problem going forward, especially if
18 further data emerge that may be relevant
19 to such cross-species age
20 extrapolations.

21 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: But the sentence that
22 says this minority view as noted is not presented --
23 that all goes?

24 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Yes.

25 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: That's correct.

1 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay. Then the way that
2 the two pieces -- so that paragraph which we just -- we
3 just edited, goes at the bottom of -- goes following
4 what is number 2.

5 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: On the other page.

6 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: On the other page.

7 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: It follows number 2.

8 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Right.

9 So that what it -- so basically what we have
10 is it would say cancer potency factors --

11 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Wait. I'm sorry. I'm
12 confused. It follows number 2?

13 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Right.

14 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: So we have A through H.

15 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Right.

16 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Right.

17 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Then the document
18 follows that.

19 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: The paragraph follows
20 that with one exception, John.

21 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Should it be 3, then?

22 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: No. In fact, you can
23 just get rid of the 2, if you want.

24 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Yeah. It's just a
25 paragraph.

1 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Okay.

2 So get rid of the 2.

3 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Get rid of the number,
4 and just -- in other words, the section would start:
5 The procedures used to consider the increased
6 susceptibility, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H.

7 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Yeah.

8 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: With the edits.

9 And the only -- the way this is inserted is
10 that the first sentence of this whole business would be
11 that sentence that we left:

12 The cancer potency factors document was
13 reviewed extensively by the SRP. From
14 the previous page.

15 Then you insert all of the stuff --

16 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Wait, Paul. Let me get
17 to it.

18 The cancer potency factors document was
19 reviewed extensively by the SRP.

20 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Right. That's the first
21 paragraph.

22 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: That's the first
23 sentence.

24 And then you insert this whole business about
25 the procedures used to consider the increased

1 susceptibility to carcinogens.

2 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Which is the old number
3 2.

4 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: And all of the stuff
5 that's edited there, A through H.

6 Then the final paragraph is this paragraph we
7 just went through that you take from the previous page:
8 There was concern with the selected age bins.

9 And it should -- by the way, there's an -- if
10 you see the sentence: There was concern with the
11 selected age bins? It should -- just delete the words
12 "of the" because that was a holdover.

13 So it's not: There was concern with the
14 selected of the age bins.

15 "There was concern with the selected age
16 bins."

17 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Okay.

18 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Okay.

19 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: So is that all clear?

20 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Yes, very clear.

21 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Okay.

22 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: And I'm not worried
23 because we have all this on record too.

24 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Well, and we have it all
25 written down here.

1 So that would be what I would suggest with the
2 edited version that everybody has in front of them. I
3 would move we accept that.

4 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Paul, do you accept it?

5 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Yes. I second.

6 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Now we're all going to
7 sing kum ba yah.

8 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: That falls into the joke
9 category. We just got sued again, Stan.

10 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Oh, we did? Okay. By
11 our friends, the diesel people?

12 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Yeah.

13 Does anybody else have comments?

14 PANEL MEMBER LANDOLPH: I just want to make a
15 procedural complaint that I think this is a messy way
16 to do business.

17 I think that -- I would recommend that people
18 try and bring this to conclusion before the meeting,
19 because I don't like doing this at the meeting. I like
20 to see things on my e-mail in my office and go through
21 them carefully.

22 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: I agree with Joe which
23 was why I was trying to get this done before we got to
24 this meeting and -- but we cannot do it in its entirety
25 because then we become a quorum.

1 We're right now a quorum making a decision as
2 a group. We cannot act as a quorum prior to the
3 meeting, and so we -- there were limitations about what
4 we could and couldn't do as a group on e-mail.

5 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: But, I mean, I'd just
6 amplify what Joe said but in a different way.

7 I think that, even if it means having fewer
8 meetings a year, I think it's rather difficult to have
9 meetings by telephone conference in this way.

10 It, I think substantively, impairs the work of
11 the panel.

12 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Well --

13 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: I understand the reasons.

14 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: I'm interested to get
15 your opinion because I strongly oppose these kinds of
16 conference calls.

17 So if everybody is in agreement that we should
18 have face-to-face meetings, then we will continue with
19 our traditional approach.

20 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Well, I generally agree
21 with that, but -- and I apologize for not bringing this
22 up earlier, these changes.

23 But I think the agenda was so abbreviated
24 today that I think the conference call, for all of its
25 clunkiness, is --

1 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: No, no. I don't disagree
2 with that. Just --

3 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: In general, I think the
4 face-to-face meetings are a lot better.

5 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: I think in general the
6 issue is also one where, for people who are in the
7 audience, either from industry or public interest
8 groups, for them, this is not a very efficient process.

9 And so I would prefer that we give people a
10 chance to hear the actual debate, you know, in a
11 face-to-face fashion.

12 And so I don't think -- I think Stan's right,
13 that we are going to have a short meeting today, and
14 that's good. And if that ever came up again, we might
15 consider it.

16 But I think there's a general consensus that
17 we have a face-to-face meeting.

18 PANEL MEMBER LANDOLPH: Yes. I completely
19 agree.

20 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Anyway, I'd like to move
21 acceptance of these findings.

22 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: I think we did and
23 seconded. You need to call the question, John.

24 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: So all persons in
25 favor -- and we'll start here: Craig?

1 PANEL MEMBER BYUS: Yes.

2 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Joe?

3 PANEL MEMBER LANDOLPH: Yes.

4 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: John's yes.

5 PANEL MEMBER GLANTZ: Stan's yes.

6 PANEL MEMBER FRIEDMAN: Gary, yes.

7 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: Paul, yes.

8 PANEL MEMBER PLOPPER: Charlie, yes.

9 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: So we're in good shape.

10 Thank you, everybody. And particularly --

11 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: I'd like to move we
12 adjourn.

13 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Thank you for -- no.
14 I'm in the middle of a sentence. I'd rather not have
15 an adjournment motion when I'm in the middle of a
16 sentence.

17 I think that we also want to thank OEHHA for
18 all of its efforts. These are -- this has been a
19 monumental task. And even though there were some
20 disagreements, Melanie and her group did a remarkable
21 job in putting this together.

22 So I just want to have it on the record that
23 we compliment them.

24 And now we can have a motion for adjournment.

25 PANEL MEMBER BYUS: I'd like to say one more

1 thing, though. They did a good job, and the panel
2 discussions were really very good.

3 Originally, I read the document and thought it
4 had a lot of significant problems. But the more we
5 discussed it, the more it was clarified in our
6 meetings, and the more I read in response to that, I
7 came around completely.

8 So I mean I think that was a very valuable
9 process, the discussion of it, the interaction that
10 occurred and adds to its value in the end.

11 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: And Craig and Joe and I
12 have all completed our advanced statistics class, so
13 we're really ready.

14 (Interruption by the reporter)

15 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: Paul?

16 PANEL MEMBER BLANC: I move to adjourn.

17 CHAIRPERSON FROINES: We will just say: Is
18 there any opposition to adjournment?

19 Hearing none, I declare this meeting to be
20 closed.

21 And congratulations.

22 * * *

23 (Thereupon the AIR RESOURCES BOARD
24 SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL meeting
25 adjourned at 10:40 a.m.)

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 I, LINDA KAY RIGEL, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

4 That I am a disinterested person herein; that
5 the foregoing AIR RESOURCES BOARD SCIENTIFIC REVIEW
6 PANEL meeting was reported in shorthand by me, Linda
7 Kay Rigel, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State
8 of California, and thereafter transcribed into
9 typewriting.

10 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
11 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in
12 any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
14 hand this May 19, 2009.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

LINDA KAY RIGEL, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 13196

