DRAFT LETTER to EPA Administrator on Lead

Lisa P. Jackson, Administrator
United States Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20460
RE: Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention

Dear Administrator Jackson:

The Children’s Health Protection Advisory Committee (CHPAC) has been asked by the Office of Children’s Health Protection (OCHP) to provide input on upcoming lead regulations being considered by the Environmental Protection Agency as well as childhood lead poisoning prevention activities across the agency and in partnership with stakeholders and other agencies. In the past, EPA has played a leadership role in reducing exposures to lead and CHPAC encourages EPA to continue. Despite this, childhood lead poisoning remains a persistent public health problem especially among children living in older, poorly maintained housing, children under the age of six years and children of color. No “safe” threshold of exposure has ever been identified, including recent reviews by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Scientific Advisory Board and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s Advisory Committee on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention. This demonstrates the need for EPA to examine its current and pending policies and programs aimed at preventing childhood lead exposure and to take action.

CHPAC is concerned that both Congress and this Administration have recently abandoned the battle to protect children from lead poisoning. While we recognize that some of this may be beyond the control of an EPA Administrator, the 1992 Residential Lead Hazard Reduction Act (Title X) provided EPA with statutory authority under the Toxic Substances Control Act to address certain key lead exposure sources related to housing. EPA also has statutory authority to address lead in air, drinking water, hazardous waste and other media. Housing with deteriorated lead-based paint, contaminated housedust and contaminated bare residential soil account for 70% of the nation’s lead poisoning cases. Title X and related statutes mandate that the nation’s lead poisoning prevention efforts involve a three-legged stool to address the problem:

- EPA sets standards for exposure, training for inspectors and abatement contractors, environmental laboratory quality control, and disclosure (with HUD);
- CDC develops guidance for clinicians, supports staffing and surveillance at local lead poisoning prevention programs, conducts population-based prevalence studies to find children at greatest risk, ensures blood lead laboratory quality control, and conducts intervention in certain international disasters, such as the hundreds of children who died from lead poisoning in Nigeria;
- HUD supports local lead hazard control programs and enforces lead requirements in federally assisted housing programs.

Without all three legs, the nation cannot succeed in addressing childhood lead poisoning.
The CDC program for 2012 has been largely eliminated and EPA and HUD programs have inadequate (and increasingly fewer) resources. As a leader in children’s health protection, this requires your immediate and urgent attention.

There are nearly half a million children who have blood lead levels above 5 μg/dL,\(^4\) which has recently been recommended by the CDC Advisory Committee on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention as the reference value.\(^5\) Over 30 million houses still have lead-based paint.\(^6\) The National Toxicology Program recently drafted a major review showing the harm that lead does to children, pregnant women and breast feeding mothers is even worse than we thought previously, with sufficient evidence now available to conclude that at levels of exposure < 5 μg/dL, a relationship clearly exists linking lead with decreased academic achievement and specific cognitive measures, increased incidence of ADHD and problem behaviors.\(^7\)

How can education be a priority for the nation if at the same time we ignore the impact of lead exposure on academic achievement? It costs $38,000 to provide special education to a child with lead poisoning.\(^8\) Many studies have shown that lead poisoning prevention saves billions of dollars.\(^9\) More than that, it avoids needless pain and suffering.

Thousands of imported consumer products contaminated with lead continue to pose major threats to our children.\(^10\) The average blood lead level in the U.S. is still over a hundred times above background levels.\(^11\)

The retreat from childhood lead poisoning prevention will especially affect children of color and from low-income families where the risks are greatest and will not save money. Increasing the disparities and environmental injustices will only serve to add to the burden of these families. The Executive Order regarding Environmental Justice has recently been updated.\(^12\)

EPA’s recent lead poisoning prevention efforts have been wanting, mainly due to inadequate resources. The Agency has taken only one or two enforcement actions to implement its Renovation, Repair and Painting Rule in the three years after it was promulgated. The Agency rejected a proposed rule to require dust lead testing following renovation to ensure cleanup is done properly and that children are protected,\(^13\) as is already required in federally-assisted housing and many local rules.\(^14\) EPA has not updated its dust lead standard, despite reports from its Science Advisory Board\(^15\) and well-documented evidence that the existing standards promulgated more than a decade ago do not protect children adequately.\(^16\) A recently published study also shows that even in high risk houses treated 12 years ago in the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) lead hazard control grant program, dust lead levels of 10 μg/ft\(^2\) on floors and 100 μg/ft\(^2\) on window sills can be readily obtained and are feasible. These levels are far lower than the current EPA dust lead standards, which are 40 μg/ft\(^2\) for floors and 250 μg/ft\(^2\) for window sills.\(^17\)

The EPA Administrator co-chairs the President’s Task Force on Environmental Health and Safety Risks to Children with the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS). Previously, this Task Force issued the first federal interagency strategy to eliminate childhood lead
poisoning. The country did not meet the goals set. We urge the Administrator to meet with the HHS Secretary and convene a cabinet-level Task Force meeting to determine how the federal government’s lead poisoning prevention activities can be restored to meet existing and new sources of lead exposure endangering our children. Specifically, such a meeting should determine how the nation can avoid ending lead poisoning prevention programs at hundreds of local health departments due to loss of CDC funding beginning this August.

In July 2011, CHPAC was briefed on several current lead regulations under development at EPA and subsequently considered a set of OCHP charge questions. Based on these considerations, EPA should take actions on its own and/or with appropriate partners to address four overarching CHPAC recommendations:

I. Adopt a unified approach across agency actions regarding target blood lead levels;
II. Engage other federal agencies and stakeholders on implementing lead poisoning prevention actions and communication strategies;
III. Identify emerging sources of lead exposure and children who may be at risk for these exposure sources; and
IV. Eliminate production of residential lead-based paint and the production of other sources of lead exposure in other countries;

I. CHPAC Recommends that EPA adopt a unified approach across agency actions regarding target blood lead levels.

I.a. CHPAC recommends that EPA revise its Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic (IEUBK) model for estimating children’s blood lead levels associated with different and multiple exposure pathways. Historically, EPA has used the IEUBK model to attempt a unified approach to estimating potential blood lead levels from environmental and other data. While the IEUBK model has been helpful in the past, there are important limitations that CHPAC believes can be overcome in part by simultaneous consideration of epidemiological data, consistent with recommendations made by EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB). An important limitation of the model is the lack of a dust lead loading metric. Instead, the model only permits input of dust lead concentration (loading refers to lead mass divided by surface area [µg/ft²] while concentration refers to lead mass divided by total sample weight [mg/kg]). Dust lead exposure has been shown to be one of the most significant sources of exposure to children and loading is the most appropriate metric for exposure. The lack of the loading metric in the IEUBK model means that conversion factors needed to be developed for use in the model, which introduces another potential source of error. The model also necessitates the use of default terms that may or may not be relevant to a specific regulatory action. CHPAC agrees with the SAB recommendation that epidemiological studies should be evaluated as well, because they do not require the use of conversion factors or default assumptions. This recommendation will enable EPA policymakers to understand all scientific evidence from both the IEUBK model and epidemiological data.
I.b. CHPAC recommends that EPA adopt an incremental approach to specifying target blood lead levels. Ideally, regulations should be crafted to eliminate exposures entirely and that should be an expressed goal in all EPA regulations. Because it is not possible to eliminate all exposures, EPA regulatory actions should produce consistent results by using an incremental rather than a static target blood lead level. The blood lead metric is both a measure of exposure and a measure of toxicity. Traditionally, EPA has set an exposure limit for dust that is expected to achieve a static target blood lead level, such as 1 or 5 or 10 µg/dL. The alternative is to select and use incremental levels in dust, soil, food, water, air and other relevant media that result in a corresponding incremental change in blood lead level, such that the incremental change is no greater than 1 or 2.5 µg/dL. CHPAC believes that an incremental approach to exposure assessment is superior, because it is more likely to be able to account for measured and estimated contributions to exposures from all exposure pathways. However, programs across EPA must also agree on the overall limit for an incremental change in blood level (this will be based on the corresponding decrement in a health or cognitive measure such as IQ). This recommendation is consistent with EPA’s Science Advisory Board\textsuperscript{22} and its Clean Air Science Advisory Committee.\textsuperscript{23}

I.c. CHPAC recommends that EPA collect data from its Environmental Lead Laboratory Proficiency Testing Program and assess feasibility for reliably measuring low environmental lead levels and also analyze housing data to assess the feasibility of meeting lower residential dust lead exposure limits. An important consideration for lead poisoning prevention regulations is whether a given exposure limit can be reliably measured and is achievable and is sustainable, because there is little benefit to setting a regulatory standard that no one can meet or cannot be measured. CHPAC recommends that EPA assess the ability of laboratories to detect levels of lead in environmental samples as an essential component of its Environmental Lead Laboratory Proficiency Testing Program (ELLPAT). This program provides standardized approaches for assessing proficiency (e.g., blind testing of samples with known quantities of lead) and assesses specific laboratory performance. CHPAC recommends that EPA collect data on laboratory detection and reporting limits as part of its ELLPAT program to inform its regulatory efforts as they apply to feasibility. With regard to cost-effectiveness, CHPAC recommends that EPA consider the health impact of regulatory decisions and the costs associated with decrements to health, not just the cost associated with compliance. EPA should also analyze new data from long-term follow-up studies of the HUD Lead Hazard Control Grant Program to determine the feasibility of meeting lower exposure limits for lead dust. EPA should revise the RRP rule to include clearance testing, which at this time is the only validated method that has been correlated with children’s blood lead levels,\textsuperscript{24} and it is the only method that has an quality control system in place (ELLPAT).

I.d. CHPAC recommends developing new, evidence-based health protective lead dust standards. Perform research and/or analyze existing data to determine what dust loading standards are, in fact, health protective. Develop laboratory methodologies to permit routine, precise and accurate dust loading measurements in the necessary range. Incorporate the new standards into ongoing lead management education programs.
I. CHPAC recommends that EPA review hazard control studies across agency actions, including revisions to the Lead and Copper Rule.

Durability of exposure controls should be examined by the agency as it considers revisions to its Lead and Copper Rule for drinking water. Specifically, the agency should examine the long-term effectiveness of managing hazards from lead service lines through drinking water chemistry interventions intended to reduce lead content in drinking water. CHPAC also recommends that any revised regulation for drinking water end the practice of partial lead pipe replacements, which has been shown to at least temporarily increase lead in drinking water. Any new regulation should provide the legal foundation to permit leaded drinking water lines to be replaced completely, not only up to the property line.

II. CHPAC Recommends that EPA engage other federal agencies and stakeholders on implementing lead poisoning prevention actions and communication strategies.

II.a. CHPAC recommends that the EPA Administrator and the Secretary of Health and Human Services convene a cabinet-level meeting of the Interagency Task Force on Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks to develop and coordinate strategies to advance childhood lead poisoning prevention through enforcement, training and education of public health and health care professionals, communication strategies, and engagement of other stakeholders. CHPAC believes that one of the biggest areas of untapped opportunity in lead poisoning prevention involves concerted and coordinated enforcement of existing laws with the Department of Justice, State Attorneys General, local prosecutors and local health, environmental and housing advocates. EPA should partner with the Health Resource Service Administration (HRSA) and CDC, Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs) and health insurance companies to ensure that funds available for prevention, such as those in the Affordable Care Act are used in a way that incorporates lead hazard control activities. There are also important steps that other agencies, such as CDC, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), can take to protect children and families from contaminated consumer products, especially those imported from other countries. For example, FDA and other agencies should take action to prevent contaminated food, herbal remedies, and pottery from entering the country and prevent lead shot fragments in the food chain. CPSC should ensure that products recalled due to lead contamination are not allowed to be sent to other countries where they could poison children. EPA should work with the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) to ensure workers do not take home lead and to conduct workforce training. CDC should continue to provide increased technical assistance to countries battling epidemics of childhood lead poisoning, such as the recent catastrophe in Nigeria that resulted in hundreds of children’s deaths from lead poisoning.

II.b. CHPAC recommends that EPA engage health and other professionals who can play an important role in providing information for families and communities regarding other sources of lead exposure such as take-home lead from the workplace (renovation...
sites, battery manufacturers, etc.), hobbies, sporting equipment (making lead weights for fishing lines at home), and reloading of ammunition used for hunting. CHPAC recommends that EPA work with other federal agencies, such as HHS and the Maternal and Child Health Bureau and HUD, to standardize training of non-traditional workers and utilize them to implement evidence-based lead exposure reduction strategies and educate residents at the community level. CHPAC recommends that EPA provide guidance for training of residents and practicing physicians as well as other healthcare providers about the harmful effects of lead exposure and avoidance practices. EPA should partner with American Academy of Pediatrics, American Academy of Family Practitioners, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and CDC to create a module for maintenance of certification on lead exposure, lead monitoring and avoidance practices. EPA should partner with CDC to create a training module for physicians and nurse practitioners that can be integrated into the medical school/nurse practitioner curriculum.

### III. CHPAC recommends that EPA identify emerging sources of lead exposure to children and women who are or may become pregnant or who are breastfeeding.

Further research is needed to identify emerging sources of lead exposure, such as those in consumer products. The nation still has no good assessment of exposures related to consumer products containing lead, like toys, jewelry, cosmetics, pottery, and batteries, especially those from other countries. For example, it is not known whether new lead-based residential paint now being manufactured in China, India, Nigeria and other countries is being imported into the U.S. Research is needed to determine if lead stabilizers used in plastics and other products is being released. Fate and transport studies are needed to determine sources of lead production and use in commercial products. Further research is needed to estimate exposures from commercial buildings. Sampling protocols to reliably measure lead in water in different building configurations is needed, and policy research is needed to determine the best way to stop partial replacement of lead drinking water lines. Specifically, the current practice is for public utilities to replace only the portion of the lead drinking water line on public property, with the owner expected to pay for the pipe replacement on the private property, which often cannot occur because owners do not have adequate resources.

### IV. CHPAC recommends that EPA work to eliminate production of residential lead-based paint and the production of other sources of lead exposure in other countries.

EPA should provide financial and technical support for the Global Alliance to Eliminate Lead in Paints, currently being developed by the World Health Organization (WHO). The Agency should also support voluntary compliance programs for lead production activities in developing nations, such as BEST (Better Environmental Sustainability Targets). EPA should work with the State Department, WHO and the United Nations Environment program to help prevent lead exposures to refugees and others, and to promote international trade agreements and other instruments to eliminate the
unnecessary use of lead in consumer and other products, as recommended by the
American Public Health Association.  

CHPAC urges you to consider these recommendations to ensure that lead poisoning prevention
is not relegated to the status of a “pyrrhic” hollow victory. The battle has not yet been won and
the problem remains large. CHPAC urges you to take action to ensure that the battle against lead
poisoning becomes a true victory.

Respectfully,

---
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