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**FEDERAL ISSUES**

**TSCA ISSUES**

**EPA Releases CDR Information**

EPA released on February 11, 2013, the 2012 CDR information on more than 7,600 chemicals in commerce. The CDR rule requires companies that manufacture or import chemicals to report manufacturing and import data every four years when site-specific production volume exceeds 25,000 pounds. The data released are for calendar year 2011. According to EPA, it received reports on 7,674 chemicals, including 354 that were reported as used in children’s products. 1,704 chemicals were reported as used in consumer products, and 3,073 were used in commercial applications or products. The remaining chemicals reported were for industrial use only. The CDR information includes data on chemicals that are used in children’s products such as toys, playground and sporting equipment, arts and crafts materials, and textiles and furniture. The 2012 CDR information is available at <http://www.epa.gov/cdr>. EPA states that users can download or search the database. In addition, users can tailor the search results to view information on specific uses of chemicals, such as those used in products intended for use with children.

**STATE ISSUES**

**IC2 Seeks Comment On Draft Guidance For Alternatives Assessment And Risk Reduction**

IC2 and participating states announced in March 2013 the availability of a draft version of the *Guidance for Alternatives Assessment and Risk Reduction* for public review and comment. The draft Guidance is intended to meet the needs of a wide range of users, who will use it for different purposes. The draft Guidance presents three decision making frameworks used in related processes.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, and each module can be completed to 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 alternatives assessment appropriate to the chemical, product, or process under assessment. The draft Guidance includes the “AA Golden Rule: The objective of an alternatives assessment is to replace chemicals of concern in products or processes with inherently safer alternatives, thereby protecting and enhancing human health and the environment.” Comments are due **April 19, 2013**. More information is available at <http://www.newmoa.org/prevention/ic2/aaguidance.cfm>.

***Alaska***

**House Bill Introduced Concerning Chemicals In Children’s Products**

On February 1, 2013, H.B. 96, which concerns chemicals of high concern and chemicals in children’s products, was introduced. The bill would require Alaska to adopt and publish a list of chemicals of high concern, require manufacturers to disclose the toxic chemicals they add to products, and authorize the state to require safer alternatives. The bill was referred to the House Committees on Labor and Commerce and Judiciary. The sponsor statement is available at <http://www.akdemocrats.org/index.php?bill=HB96>.

***California***

**DTSC Releases Revised Proposed Safer Consumer Product Regulations**

On January 30, 2013, DTSC released revised proposed Safer Consumer Product Regulations, which would establish a process for identifying and prioritizing consumer products and their chemicals of concern, evaluating their alternatives, and imposing regulatory responses. Comments were due February 28, 2013. The revised proposed Regulations are available at <http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SCPRegulations.cfm>. More information is available in B&C’s February 6, 2013, memorandum, which is available at <http://www.lawbc.com/regulatory-developments/entry/dtsc-releases-revised-proposed-safer-consumer-products-regulations/>.

**DTSC Accepting Comments On External Scientific Peer Review Reports And California Environmental Policy Council Resolution**

On March 13, 2013, DTSC began a 15-day public comment period on the following documents, which were added to the rulemaking file:

* ***External Scientific Peer Review Reports***: DTSC complied with Health and Safety Code Section 57004 regarding submission of the scientific portions of the January 29, 2013, post-hearing changes to the proposed regulations to an external scientific peer review. The documents were submitted to scientific peer reviewers through the University of California. Their written reports contain an evaluation of the scientific basis of the post-hearing changes to the proposed regulations; and
* ***California Environmental Policy Council Resolution***: Health and Safety Code Section 25252.5, subject to a specified exception, requires DTSC to prepare, and submit to the Council for review, a multimedia life cycle evaluation prior to adopting these regulations. The law provides an exception to this requirement if the Council conclusively determines that the regulations will not have any significant adverse impacts on public health or the environment. During the February 28, 2013, meeting of the Council, written and oral testimony was accepted on the issue described herein. The Council unanimously made a conclusive determination that the adoption of these regulations would not have a significant adverse impact on public health or the environment. Thus, DTSC is not required to prepare a multimedia life cycle evaluation for these regulations.

Comments are due **March 28, 2013**. The documents are available at <http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SCPRegulations.cfm>.

***Connecticut***

**House Bill Would Restrict Use Of Cadmium In Children’s Jewelry**

H.B. 6498, which would restrict the use of **cadmium** in children’s jewelry, was introduced in the House on February 27, 2013. Under the bill, effective **October 1, 2014**, no person shall manufacture, sell, offer for sale, or distribute any children’s jewelry that contains **cadmium** at more than .0075 percent by weight. The bill was referred to the Joint Committee on Children, which held a public hearing on March 5, 2013. The public hearing testimony is available at <http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/menu/CommDocTmyBillAllComm.asp?bill=HB-06498&doc_year=2013>. On March 12, 2013, the bill failed the joint favorable deadline.

**Bill Would Identify Chemicals Of High Concern To Children**

On March 5, 2013, the Connecticut legislature held a hearing on H.B. 6526, under which the Commissioner of Public Health would identify chemicals of high concern to children. The bill would require manufacturers of children’s products to provide notice if the product contains a chemical of high concern. The Commissioner of Public Health, in consultation with the Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection, would create and maintain a list of priority chemicals that are of high concern to children after considering a child’s or developing fetus’s potential for exposure to each chemical. Not later than **January 1, 2014**, and every two years thereafter, the Commissioners would identify two or more chemicals for inclusion on such list. The bill specifies that the Commissioners may include chemicals that are included on Maine’s list of chemicals of high concern and the Washington list of chemicals of high concern for children, or that meet certain criteria. On March 21, 2013, the bill was referred to the Office of Legislative Research and Office of Fiscal Analysis. The public hearing testimony is available at <http://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/menu/CommDocTmyBillAllComm.asp?bill=HB-06526&doc_year=2013>.

***Florida***

**Bills Concerning Chemicals Of High Concern Introduced In The House And Senate**

On March 5, 2013, H.B. 773 and S.B. 1154, which concern chemicals of high concern, were introduced. Under the bills, by **January 1, 2014**, the Department of Environmental Protection, in consultation with the Department of Health, would publish an initial list of at least 50 chemicals of high concern. H.B. 773 was referred to the House Agriculture and Natural Resources Appropriations Subcommittee and the House State Affairs Committee. S.B. 1154 was referred to the Senate Environmental Preservation and Conservation Committee and Appropriations Subcommittee on General Government.

***Hawaii***

**Bills Would Prohibit Cadmium In Packages And Packaging**

On March 7, 2013, H.B. 351 and S.B. 640 failed the first crossover deadline. The bills would prohibit the use of packages and packaging containing lead, **cadmium**, mercury, and hexavalent chromium. The prohibition would take effect **January 1, 2014**. More information is available in our January 28, 2013, Update.

**House Bill Would Prohibit Cadmium In Children’s Products**

On March 7, 2013, H.B. 585 failed the first crossover deadline. H.B. 585 would prohibit the sale, manufacture, and distribution of children’s products that contain **cadmium** more than .004 percent by weight. A hearing on the bill was held January 30, 2013.

***Illinois***

**Senate Bill Would Make Technical Change To Cadmium-Safe Kids Act**

On March 20, 2013, the Senate Committee on Executive passed S.B. 857, which would amend the **Cadmium**-Safe Kids Act, making a technical change in a section concerning the short title.

***Maine***

**Senate Bill Intends To Protect Pregnant Women And Children From Toxic Chemicals**

L.D. 1181, which was introduced on March 26, 2013, would amend the Kid-Safe Products Act to further strengthen the protection of pregnant women and children from toxic chemicals. The bill would require the designation of two additional priority chemicals by **January 1, 2014**, and two additional priority chemicals by January 1 every year thereafter unless the criteria for designation are not met. On March 26, 2013, the Senate and House referred the bill in concurrence to the Joint Committee on Environment and Natural Resources.

***Massachusetts***

**Senate Bill Would Regulate Cadmium In Children’s Jewelry**

On February 15, 2013, S.B. 990, which would regulate **cadmium** in children’s jewelry, was introduced. The bill would ban the manufacture, sale, and distribution of children’s jewelry containing **cadmium** in any paint or surface coating or accessible substrate that exceeds 75 ppm. The bill would also ban the manufacture, sale, and distribution of children’s dishes containing **cadmium** in any paint, glaze, or surface coating or accessible substrate that exceeds 0.25 micrograms per milliliter. The ban would apply to products manufactured after **December 31, 2013**.

**Joint Committee Holds Hearing On “Toxic Management Issues”**

The Joint Committee on Environment, Natural Resources and Agriculture held a joint hearing on March 27, 2013, on toxic management issues. The agenda included the following bills:

* S.B. 354, “An Act relative to healthy families and businesses”: Under the bill, TURI would publish a “chemicals of concern” list. The bill states that TURI “shall rely on published authoritative lists of chemical categorizations such as, but not limited to, the Canadian Domestic Substances List Categorization, the European Commission’s list of substances of very high concern, Washington State’s list of Chemicals of Concern, the California Safer Consumer Products list of Chemicals of Concern, the State of Maine’s List of Chemicals of High Concern, and the International Agency for Research on Cancer’s list of carcinogens”; and
* S.B. 387, “An Act for a competitive economy through safer alternatives to toxic chemicals”: The bill would require chemical action plans for three chemicals and specific uses, including **cadmium** as found in children’s products. The chemical action plans would: (a) identify specific actions that manufacturers and users of these chemical substances shall be required to implement; (b) require substitution of a safer alternative; (c) establish schedules, timelines, and deadlines for achieving substitution with safer alternatives, for specified uses; (d) where appropriate, require manufacturers or users to prepare and submit plans to effect the substitution(s); and (e) provide for technical assistance to manufacturers and users of these chemical substances.

***Michigan***

**Michigan Proposes Changes To Occupational Health Standard For Cadmium**

The February 1, 2013, issue of the *Michigan Register* includes a proposed rule that would amend the occupational health standard for **cadmium**. The proposed changes are a result of the Workplace Safety Advisory Rules Committee’s recommendations to the Office of Regulatory Reinvention for changes to Occupational Health Standard Part 309 **Cadmium**. Additional changes were made to the proposed draft to make Michigan’s rules “at least as effective as” OSHA. In addition, according to the Office of Regulatory Reinvention, minor editorial changes, such as revising the name of the department, are being made. The amendments would revise the hazard communication requirements, including warning signs and warning labels. Comments were due February 22, 2013. More information is available at <http://www7.dleg.state.mi.us/orr/Rules.aspx?type=Number&id=R+325.51851>. The February 1, 2013, issue of the *Michigan Register* is available at <http://www.michigan.gov/documents/lara/MR1_020113_410118_7.pdf>.

**Senate Bill Would Ban Cadmium In Toys And Child Care Articles**

There is no new publicly available information to report regarding S.B. 17, which would define a toxic substance as a substance that contains more than 0.06 percent of the total by weight of one or more heavy metals, including **cadmium**. The bill would prohibit a person from using or applying a toxic substance in or onto any toy or child care article, or manufacturing a toy or child care article with a part that is a toxic substance. The bill would also prohibit a person from selling, offering for sale, or transferring a toy or child care article that contains a toxic substance.

***Minnesota***

**Bills Would Require Manufacturers To Report Priority Chemicals**

H.B. 605 and S.B. 466 would amend Minnesota’s priority chemical identification criteria and require manufacturers of children’s products that contain priority chemicals to provide information to the MPCA. The bills would authorize the MPCA to prohibit sales of children’s products that contain priority chemicals. H.B. 605 was referred to the House Health and Human Services Policy Committee, which passed the bill on February 28, 2013, and referred it to the House Civil Law Committee. On March 6, 2013, the Civil Law Committee passed the bill, and referred it to the House Commerce and Consumer Protection Finance and Policy Committee, which passed the bill on March 13, 2013. The bill was then referred to the House Environment and Natural Resources Policy Committee. S.B. 466 was passed by the Senate Environment and Energy Committee on February 25, 2013. The Senate Judiciary Committee passed the bill on March 5, 2013, and the Senate Health, Human Services and Housing Committee passed the bill on March 7, 2013. The bill was then referred to the Senate Commerce Committee.

***Nevada***

**Assembly Bill Would Require Department To Identify Chemicals Of High Concern**

A.B. 354, which was introduced on March 18, 2013, would require the Health Division of the Department of Health and Human Services to identify a list of at least 50 chemicals of high concern. The bill was referred to the Assembly Committee on Commerce and Labor.

***New York***

**Assembly Bill Would Ban Sale And Distribution Of Cadmium-Added Novelty Consumer Products**

A.B. 4822, which was introduced on February 11, 2013, would ban the sale and distribution of any **cadmium**-added novelty consumer product. The bill would require a manufacturer that produces or sells **cadmium**-added novelty consumer products to notify retailers about the product ban and inform such retailers how to dispose properly of the remaining inventory. The ban would take effect on **June 1, 2015**. The bill was referred to the Assembly Committee on Environmental Conservation.

**Assembly Bill Introduced Concerning Standards For Cadmium In Children’s Jewelry**

On March 4, 2013, A.B. 5615 was introduced. The bill would direct the Commissioner of Health to establish standards concerning **cadmium** in children’s jewelry. The bill was referred to the Assembly Committee on Health.

**Assembly Bill Introduced Concerning Hazardous Toys**

A.B. 5824, which was introduced on March 6, 2013, concerns hazardous toys and other articles intended for use by children. A toy would be contaminated with a toxic substance if it meets certain conditions, including if it is coated with paints and lacquers containing soluble compounds of **cadmium**. The bill was referred to the Assembly Committee on Consumer Affairs and Protection.

**Assembly Bill Would Prohibit Cadmium In Children’s Products**

On March 25, 2013, A.B. 6283 was introduced and referred to the Assembly Committee on Environmental Conservation. The bill would prohibit the sale of a children’s product in which any **cadmium** has been intentionally introduced as an element during manufacturing or distribution.

**Assembly Bill Would Regulate Toxic Chemicals In Children’s Products**

A.B. 6328, which was introduced on March 25, 2013, would regulate toxic chemicals in children’s products. The bill would define priority chemicals and chemicals of high concern, which would include those on Maine’s list of chemicals of high concern. Effective **January 1, 2018**, the sale of a children’s product containing a priority chemical that has been listed for at least one year would be banned. The bill was referred to the Assembly Committee on Environmental Conservation.

**Senate Bill Would Regulate Cadmium In Children’s Jewelry**

There is no new publicly available information to report regarding S.B. 854, which would regulate **cadmium** in substrate in children’s jewelry and provide that no children’s jewelry shall be sold or distributed that contains **cadmium** in accessible metal or plastic substrate components exceeding certain levels.

***North Carolina***

**NCSAB Meeting Agenda Includes Cadmium Discussion**

The agenda for NCSAB’s **April 17, 2013**, meeting includes **cadmium**. **Cadmium** was included on the agenda for the January 30, 2013, meeting, which was canceled. The NCSAB met on February 20, 2013. Meeting minutes are not yet available. More information regarding NCSAB is available at <http://daq.state.nc.us/toxics/risk/sab/>.

***Oregon***

**House Bill Would Require List Of High Priority Chemicals Of Concern For Children’s Health**

H.B. 3162, which was introduced on February 22, 2013, would require the Oregon Health Authority to maintain a list of designated high priority chemicals of concern for children’s health used in children’s products. Under the bill, the list of high priority chemicals would include chemicals that are listed on both the Department of Environmental Quality’s Toxics Focus List and the Washington Department of Ecology’s List of Chemicals of High Concern to Children. **Cadmium** is included on both lists. Manufacturers of certain children’s products would be required to provide notice regarding chemicals on the list. Five years after a chemical is placed on the list, a manufacturer must seek waiver if the manufacturer continues to sell children’s product containing the high priority chemical of concern. On March 1, 2013, the bill was referred to the House Committee on Health Care.

***Vermont***

**Senate Bill Would Require Toxic Chemical Identification And Reduction Program**

S.B. 117, which was introduced on February 19, 2013, would require the Secretary of Natural Resources to establish a toxic chemical identification and reduction program. Under the program, the Secretary would identify chemicals of high concern, and designate a chemical of high concern as a priority chemical if certain conditions are met. Children’s products containing a priority chemical would be prohibited from sale or distribution. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Energy.

**MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES**

**ATSDR Releases Final Report On Vieques**

On March 19, 2013, ATSDR released its final report on whether the U.S. Navy exposed Vieques residents to harmful levels of chemicals. In the summary fact sheet, ATSDR provides the following information regarding produce and livestock:

We have little information about local garden produce and livestock contamination on Vieques[,] so ATSDR cannot make firm conclusions about health hazards from eating these foods. Limited information suggests locally grown pigeon peas may contain **cadmium**, though these data are uncertain. It is uncertain whether **cadmium** is elevated in soils where the pigeon peas were collected. Our evaluation concluded that children could eat up to 30 ounces weekly of locally grown pigeon peas and would not add too much **cadmium** to their diet. Adults could eat up to 132 ounces weekly.

More information is available at <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/sites/vieques/2013_report.html>.

**IRIS Assessment**

***Status Of EPA’s Implementation Of NRC Recommendations Concerning IRIS***

EPA posted on January 30, 2013, materials submitted to the NRC committee reviewing the IRIS assessment development process. EPA lists the materials submitted as:

* Part 1: Status of Implementation of Recommendations (Jan. 30, 2013), available at <http://www.epa.gov/iris/pdfs/IRIS%20Program%20Materials%20to%20NRC_Part%201.pdf>; and
* Part 2: Chemical-Specific Examples (Jan. 30, 2013), available at <http://www.epa.gov/iris/pdfs/IRIS%20Program%20Materials%20to%20NRC_Part%202.pdf>.

In the Part 1 document, EPA outlines NRC’s 2011 recommendations and provides an overview of how the IRIS Program is implementing NRC’s general and specific recommendations. EPA includes further details regarding changes that have been made and will be made in response to the recommendations in Appendices to the report.

In the Part 2 document, EPA provides chemical-specific examples demonstrating how the IRIS Program is currently implementing NRC’s 2011 recommendations. The examples, which do not include **cadmium**, cover literature search and screening, evaluation and display of individual studies, development of evidence tables, evidence integration, selecting studies for derivation of toxicity values, dose-response modeling output, and considerations for selecting organ/system-specific or overall toxicity values. EPA notes that the examples “are not to be construed as final Agency conclusions and are provided for the sole purpose of demonstrating how the IRIS Program is implementing the NRC recommendations.”

The next NRC committee meeting will be held **March 27-29, 2013**. Staff involved in preparing for the meeting stated that they are “currently in the process of confirming the dates and figuring out how much of the meeting will be open to the public.”

***EPA OIG Issues Report On EPA Use Of IRIS***

EPA OIG released a January 31, 2013, report entitled *Congressionally Requested Information on EPA Utilization of Integrated Risk Information System*. OIG collected the information in response to a Congressional request to “determine if EPA program offices and regions incorporate in their regulatory decision-making the exposure dose concentrations or values that are listed in the database.” Based on the results of its survey, OIG states that 85 percent of the respondents reported using IRIS as their primary source for cancer values and 81 percent used IRIS as their primary source for non-cancer values. Of those who reported using IRIS as their primary source for cancer values, 51 percent indicated they did so because it was required for the activity they were conducting. Similarly, 52 percent of the respondents who reported using IRIS as the primary source for non-cancer values indicated they did so because it was required for the activity they were conducting. OIG states: “We found no EPA policy mandating the use of any toxicity database including IRIS.” OIG notes that OSWER issued a directive recommending IRIS as the first tier source of human health toxicity values. Sixty-seven percent of the respondents reported using IRIS for Superfund program activities. Sixty-five percent of respondents also indicated that there are standard operating procedures regarding how to choose a source of toxicity values. According to OIG’s report, 16 percent of respondents identified the OSWER directive as this standard operating procedure. The report is available at <http://epa.gov/oig/reports/2013/20130131-13-P-0127.pdf>.

***Updated IRIS Track Schedules Do Not Include Cadmium***

On February 5, 2013, EPA announced the availability of several updated schedules on IRIS Track. The updated schedules do not include **cadmium**. EPA has incorporated additional stakeholder engagement in the assessment development and review process. In step 1 of the IRIS process (development of the draft assessment), EPA will release the literature search and evidence tables summarizing the studies EPA proposes to consider and will hold a public dialog meeting. In step 4, EPA will release the draft assessment for public comment, hold a public dialog meeting, revise the assessment as necessary to respond to comments, and release a new draft for external peer review. EPA has revised the IRIS Track format to include the public release of the literature search and evidence tables in step 1 and the public release of two drafts during step 4. EPA states that it will announce the dates of the public dialog meetings as they are scheduled. According to EPA, it “is developing new schedules for IRIS assessments reflecting these enhancements to the process.”

***Senate Republicans Ask EPA To Clarify IRIS Chemical Assessment Reforms***

Senators David Vitter (R-LA), James Inhofe (R-OK), and Mike Crapo (R-ID) sent a letter on February 20, 2013, to EPA asking for clarification of how EPA is implementing the NAS’s recommendations for reforming the IRIS process. The Senators note that while EPA has stated its intention to improve the IRIS process to include more transparency and public participation, the NAS IRIS Panel is simultaneously conducting its review and will issue further recommendations. In addition, while EPA’s IRIS Track website lists 57 substances at various stages in the development process, EPA includes updated schedules for only 14 substances, with the remaining 43 assessments listed as TBD. The Senators urge EPA to apply IRIS reforms to all draft assessments. The Senators asked EPA to provide detailed information on how it will ensure that current draft assessments under development will benefit from proposed reforms.

***EPA Announces Preliminary Plans For IRIS Workshops***

During the 2013 Global Chemicals Regulation Conference, Lynn Flowers, NCEA, announced preliminary plans for several IRIS workshops. The subjects and timeframes for the workshops are:

* Hexavalent chromium workshop, which will be held in late **spring 2013** to discuss how this chemical is processed by and affects the stomach;
* Mouse lung tumors, which will be held in late **spring 2013** in Research Triangle Park, NC, but also allows participation via the Internet;
* Systematic reviews, which will be held early **summer 2013**; and
* Weight-of-evidence techniques, which will be held early **summer 2013**.

***SAB Announces Chemical Assessment Advisory Committee Meeting***

On **April 2-3, 2013**, the Chemical Assessment Advisory Committee will meet to receive a briefing about the IRIS Program and enhancements to the process for developing IRIS toxicological reviews for chemicals. EPA’s ORD requested that the SAB conduct peer reviews of selected IRIS chemical toxicological reviews. According to SAB’s March 5, 2013, *Federal Register* notice announcing the meeting, it will augment the Chemical Assessment Advisory Committee, as needed, with additional subject matter experts to provide advice regarding IRIS toxicological reviews through the chartered SAB.

**INTERNATIONAL ISSUES**

**Canada Releases 2011 Air Pollutant Emissions Data**

On February 15, 2013, Canada released the 2011 air pollutant emissions data. According to Canada, **cadmium** emissions decreased in 2011 compared to 2010 by 50 percent. The decrease for **cadmium**, as well as for mercury and lead emissions, “was due to a reduction in activity in the smelting and upstream oil and gas industries, as well as changes in measurement methods, notably in the case of lead.” Emissions for a number of “important pollutants” decreased between 1990 and 2011, including a decrease in **cadmium** emissions by 91 percent, mainly due to a reduction of emissions from industrial sources, including metal smelters. More information is available at <http://www.ec.gc.ca/inrp-npri/default.asp?lang=En&n=F98AFAE7-1>.

**China Amends Food Contaminant Standards, Including Cadmium**

On January 29, 2013, MOH amended the standards for 13 contaminants, including **cadmium**, in 20 categories of food, including grains, vegetables, fruit, meat, drinks, alcohol, aquatic products and seasoning. The amended standards will take effect on **June 1, 2013**.

**China Releases 12th Five-Year Plan Of Chemical Environmental Risk Prevention And Control**

On February 20, 2013, MEP published the 12th Five-Year Plan for Chemical Environmental Risk Prevention and Control (2011-15). The Plan includes a list of priority chemicals for prevention and control. Seven manufacturing industries, including nonferrous metal smelting and calendaring, have been designated as sectors to be brought under priority risk prevention and control. The Plan is available, in Chinese, at <http://www.mep.gov.cn/gkml/hbb/bwj/201302/t20130220_248271.htm>.

**Chinese Grain Vendor Denies Media Report Concerning Tainted Rice**

On February 27, 2013, Shenzhen Cereals Group Co., Ltd. denied reports that the company sold rice contaminated with **cadmium**. In May 2009, the company purchased 13,584 tonnes of rice from a supplier in central Hunan Province. The rice was found to contain excessive amounts of **cadmium**, however, and a spokesperson stated that the rice was subsequently returned to the supplier. The spokesperson produced a testing report, return agreement, and delivery bill for the returned rice, and stated: “Our company does not know how the supplier in Hunan handled the rice after we returned it.”

**CFS Announces Food Safety Report For January**

On February 28, 2013, CFS released the findings of its food safety report for January 2013. The CFS took about 2,800 samples of fresh vegetables, fruits, legumes, preserved vegetables and pickled fruits, dried vegetables, and ready-to-eat vegetables for analysis. A Chinese celery sample was found to contain **cadmium** at a level of 0.18 ppm, exceeding the legal limit of 0.1 ppm. The CFS spokesperson stated: “Based on the level detected, it is unlikely that the sample would pose any adverse health effect upon normal consumption.”

\* \* \* \* \*

Unless otherwise noted, if you have questions about any item summarized above, please call or e-mail Lynn L. Bergeson at (202) 557-3801 or [lbergeson@lawbc.com](mailto:lbergeson@lawbc.com), or Carla N. Hutton at (202) 557-3809 or [chutton@lawbc.com](mailto:chutton@lawbc.com).

## ACRONYMS

**ATSDR** -- Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry

**B&C --** Bergeson & Campbell, P.C.

**CDR** -- Chemical Data Reporting

**CFS** -- Center for Food Safety

**DTSC** -- Department of Toxic Substances Control

**EPA** -- United States Environmental Protection Agency

**IC2** -- Interstate Chemicals Clearinghouse

**ICdA** -- International Cadmium Association

**IRIS** -- Integrated Risk Information System

**MEP** -- Ministry of Environmental Protection

**MOH** -- Ministry of Health

**MPCA** -- Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

**NAS** -- National Academy of Sciences

**NCEA**-- National Center for Environmental Assessment

**NCSAB** -- North Carolina Scientific Advisory Board on Toxic Air Pollutants

**NRC** -- National Research Council

**OIG** -- Office of Inspector General

**ORD** -- Office of Research and Development

**OSHA** -- Occupational Safety and Health Administration

**OSWER** -- Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response

**ppm** -- Part Per Million

**SAB** -- Science Advisory Board

**TBD** -- To Be Determined

**TSCA** -- Toxic Substances Control Act

**TURI** -- Toxics Use Reduction Institute

1. This Update addresses significant federal, state, and international environmental and occupational safety and health regulatory issues and ongoing advocacy efforts pertinent to the ICdA member companies. A list of acronyms used in this Update is provided. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)