AIHA
Protecting Worker Health

October 9, 2015

OSHA Docket Office
Docket No. OSHA-2009-0044
U.S. Department of Labor
Room N-2625
200 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20210

RE: Docket Number OSHA-2009-0044

Submission via electronic means

Docket Officer:

The American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA) expresses its appreciation to the National Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) for the opportunity to comment on the Request for Information (RFI) on Chemical Management and Permissible Exposure Limits (PELs). The RFI was published in the *Federal Register* on October 10, 2014, Volume 79, number 197, page 61383.

AIHA is the premier association serving the needs of professionals practicing industrial hygiene in industry, government, labor, academic institutions, and independent organizations. The AIHA mission is to promote healthy and safe working environments by advancing the science, principles, practice, and value of industrial hygiene. A healthy workforce is essential to the success of American industry, our economic recovery, and our future position in the global economy.

As stated by OSHA, the agency is requesting stakeholder feedback with respect to OSHA's overall approach to managing hazardous chemical exposures in the workplace. The RFI outlines potential modifications to OSHA's current risk and feasibility assessment approaches and requests additional information about chemical management for the workplace that may be more efficient, while still maintaining worker protection.

AIHA appointed a PEL Working Group to determine the best possible way to respond to the RFI and asked for input from appropriate Volunteer Groups (composed of experts) of the association. As a result of these efforts, AIHA is submitting two separate documents:

1) A copy of the AIHA white paper "Permissible Exposure Limits (PELs)". This paper was originally adopted by AIHA in 1998, was updated in 2002 and 2009, and has been redefined and readopted in 2015. In summary, this paper states:
    a. Exposure limits such as OSHA's PELs are a primary tool in disease prevention and are an essential part of a comprehensive occupational safety and health program.

American Industrial Hygiene Association 3141 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 777, Falls Church, VA 22042 USA
main +1 703-849-8888 *fax* +1 703-207-3561

b. OSHA should seek whatever resources or legislative changes are needed to allow the updating of all existing PELs to reflect current science and to set new PELs necessary to protect worker health. In the interim OSHA should select chemicals for PELs based on scientific principles, risk determinations and specific criteria developed with all stakeholders.
c. For compliance purposes OSHA has defined PELs as values not to be exceeded. However, when designing exposure monitoring programs employers must assign a statistical interpretation to the PEL. Therefore, OSHA should continue to provide guidance regarding suitable statistical interpretations so that employers can design effective performance-based exposure monitoring programs that are consistent with OSHA's expectations.
d. OSHA should develop a peer-reviewed guideline for the derivation of PELs. AIHA believes that PELs must be based on the best scientific information available and must include a well-documented, critical evaluation of the supporting information. AIHA also believes that appropriate uncertainty factors must be applied to compensate for the inherent uncertainties in the existing data and extrapolation to human populations.
e. Employers have the responsibility to assess the risks to the health of their workers and adequately control worker exposures to hazardous substances or agents for which there are no PELs. A Hierarchy of OELs approach, risk based mathematical modeling and occupational hazard banding can bridge this gap until such time that a PEL can be derived. Employees must be consulted in the development of these risk assessments and informed of the results.
f. Employers have the responsibility to assess the risks to the health of their workers and adequately control worker exposures to hazardous substances or agents for which there are no PELs. AIHA strongly encourages the use of other tools such as hazard banding, Hierarchy of OELs, and quantitative analyses to bridge this gap until such time that a PEL can be derived. Employees must be fully consulted in the development of these risk assessments and informed of the results.
g. PELs should be consistent across occupational populations and should be accepted by other federal agencies when the goal is protecting occupational health.

2) Comments compiled from AIHA Volunteer Groups: These comments were not reviewed for approved by either the Volunteer Group or the AIHA board of directors. The comments were solicited from experts in the field of industrial hygiene and are provided to the agency as “comments for consideration submitted by experts in the field of industrial hygiene”.

AIHA believes that OSHA should provide a means for stakeholders with interest and expertise in this issue to meet and formulate a consensus on the best way to address the issue of managing hazardous chemical exposures in the workplace through PELs or consideration of alternative and/or additional efforts. AIHA is committed to participating in any such gathering as a participant or in a leadership role.

If AIHA can be of any further assistance, please contact me. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Daniel H. Anna, PhD, CIH, CSP
AIHA President

Attachments

cc: AIHA Board of Directors
Peter O'Neil, AIHA Executive Director

SUBMITTED BY
AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE ASSOCIATION

AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE ASSOCIATION

WHITE PAPER ON

PERMISSIBLE EXPOSURE LIMITS (PELs)

The focus of this white paper is the regulatory permissible exposure limits (PELs) for airborne chemicals as promulgated by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). However, recognizing that OSHA has not been able to define up-to-date PELs for every chemical of concern in the workplace, these comments go further to suggest what employers and industrial hygienists may do to bridge the gap between the number of chemicals in use and the tools to define risk when PELs are not available. The AIHA board of directors originally adopted this white paper in 1998, and subsequently updated it in 2002, 2009 and again in 2015.

1. Exposure limits such as OSHA's PELs are a primary tool in disease prevention and are an essential part of a comprehensive occupational safety and health program.

The concept of the use of exposure limits as a means of protecting worker health has evolved from the industrial hygiene community's 60-plus years of experience[i] in developing and using such limits. Maximum Allowable Concentrations (MACs), Threshold Limit Values (TLVs), Workplace Environmental Exposure Levels (WEELs), Recommended Exposure Limits (RELs), and industry-developed Occupational Exposure Limits (OELs) have been essential tools of the practicing industrial hygienist. While the goals, where stated, may differ[ii] (e.g., to limit occupational cancer to 1 case in 1000 exposed workers over a working lifetime or to protect "nearly all workers"), these exposure limits are all designed to reduce the occurrence of worker illness or impairment resulting from exposure to chemicals. The use of exposure limits to prevent occupationally related illness has been an effective tool used by industrial hygienists for more than six decades. AIHA recognizes the controversies that are often involved in the setting of these limits both in the regulatory and voluntary arenas. In developing PELs, the major concerns include scientific soundness, feasibility, timeliness, documentation, and opportunity for involvement of affected parties in the decision-making process. We believe that when these considerations are a part of the exposure limit-setting process, and when the limits are applied as part of a comprehensive occupational health and safety program, they are a primary tool in disease prevention.

2. OSHA should seek whatever resources or legislative changes are needed to allow the updating of all existing PELs to current science and to set such new PELs as necessary to protect worker health. In the meantime OSHA should select chemicals for PELs based on scientific principles, risk determinations and specific criteria developed with all stakeholders.

Leverage Existing Scientific Data: It is a disservice to worker health that the majority of OSHA PELs are based on recommendations that were made more than 45 years ago (i.e., 1968 Threshold Limit Values of the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists). AIHA strongly supports the concept that OSHA should review and update the PELs on a regular (three-to five-year) cycle considering that the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Recommended Exposure Limits (RELs), the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH) Threshold Limit Values (TLVs), OARS (Occupational Alliance for Risk Science) Workplace Environmental Exposure Levels (WEELs), and other appropriate national and international standards that are anchored by good science are reviewed and updated regularly. The limits noted above undergo extensive technical reviews and follow a formal process for development, review, and approval of individual limits. While the procedures and rationales may differ, all of these limits provide a scientifically sound starting point and foundation for the prompt and continued upgrade of the OSHA PELs. By starting with such a solid base, OSHA's historical record (new PELs for only about two dozen substances in more than 25 years, or roughly one per year) can be markedly improved and worker health protection enhanced.

Absent a regular review and update process, many more PELs will become out of date. Researchers and other professionals are constantly developing new information regarding toxicity at the molecular, organ, system and whole body levels. This information must be incorporated into the PEL update process. To make this periodic update more efficient, OSHA should leverage work undertaken by the professional groups previously identified, as well as those within the international community that have developed science-based values.

Burden of Proof: It is also critical that the burden-of-proof requirements for adopting PEL updates be more flexible than those in the present OSHA Act. The decision by the 11th Circuit Court (which resulted in the vacating of 428 PELs adopted in January 1989) suggests that OSHA follow the Administrative Procedures Act (to ensure adequate review and comment) and legislatively establish a "not arbitrary or capricious" criterion rather than a "substantial evidence on the record" criterion regarding adoption of PELs by the Agency. Other legislative approaches that provide a balance between adequate technical/scientific review and the requirements defined by legislation in the courts may well exist. A balance must be struck between the opportunity for the regulated community to review and input to a standard-setting process and the need to reduce the time period for regulatory action. The present criteria clearly need modification when one considers OSHA's limited accomplishments in this arena since 1970.

Priority of Chemicals Set: Given the difficulty OSHA has demonstrated in setting PEL standards, it is necessary to consider prioritizing chemicals for update considerations. It is also unlikely that OSHA would attempt to review, and possibly change, all exposure limits simultaneously. It also unlikely that OSHA would group chemicals into specific classes and regulate all chemicals in a certain class at the same time.

Paustenbach[iii] voices the concerns of stakeholders in the PEL update. He articulates two points regarding priorities in the update of PELs.

> "The prospect of a "list" of chemicals seems to bother everyone. To some extent, there is a general mistrust of any process wherein a certain chemical is targeted for regulation while another is not. One way to prevent this from being the focus of attack would be to drop the list entirely. Instead, the Agency might present a generic formula for different toxicological effects for calculating "preliminary" PELs for various classes of

chemicals (e.g. carcinogens, irritants, and CNS depressants). Then when consensus is reached on the formulae, the information on the various chemicals need only be put in to the "master equations", which would yield a comprehensive list of PELs for hundreds of chemicals."

"The lack of transparency in OSHA's process for selecting the initial chemicals reinforced the perception that some special interest groups were more effective than others in preventing their chemicals from 'getting listed'. This issue needs to be hit 'head on' by the agency. There seems no better way than to share publicly the data and analyses that supported the Agency's proposal. OSHA should then encourage technical comments on this information. After having assembled up-to-date information that is "more or less" accepted by the stakeholders, the Agency should then publish several different algorithms for establishing a priority list."

In summary, the process of choosing chemicals must be as objective as possible, based on sound scientific principles and specific criteria. The stakeholders must be given an opportunity to participate in every phase of this process. A weight of evidence process for judging the overall body of toxicological and epidemiologic data must be developed which clearly states procedures for evaluation of individual study data.

3. For compliance purposes OSHA has defined PELs as values not to be exceeded. When designing exposure-monitoring programs to determine exceedances, employers must assign a statistical interpretation to the PEL. Therefore, OSHA should continue to provide guidance regarding suitable statistical interpretations. Employers can thus design effective performance-based exposure monitoring programs that are consistent with OSHA's expectations.

OSHA has provided some guidance regarding the statistical interpretation of various PELs. In the preamble to the 1987 benzene standard, OSHA acknowledged that exposures derive from continuous distributions where there is some finite probability of a random overexposure, even in a controlled work environment. OSHA stated, in both the benzene preamble and the preamble to the 1978 lead PEL that the long-term average exposure should be "well below" the PEL. The 1992 formaldehyde standard included a non-mandatory appendix that suggested that statistical tests could be used as part of an exposure sampling strategy:

"...a properly designed sampling strategy showing that all employees are exposed below the PELs, at least with a 95 percent certainty, is compelling evidence that the exposure limits are being achieved..."

This appendix was derived from the NIOSH 1977 Occupational Exposure Sampling Strategy manual, in which NIOSH stated:

"In statistical terms, the employer should try to attain 95% confidence that no more than 5% of employee days are over the standard."

Along similar lines, the AIHA Exposure Assessment Strategies Committee (EASC) recommends that the exposure profile - or distribution of exposures - of a Similar Exposure Group (and by extension, the exposure profile of each member of the exposure group) be controlled to the point that the 95th percentile exposure is less than the PEL. Statistically analyzing the data and determining if the 95%

upper confidence limit for the 95th percentile is less than the PEL can develop compelling evidence that the exposure profile is controlled. If a substance is strictly a chronic disease agent, the EASC suggests that it is reasonable to focus attention on the long-term average exposure (LTA) or mean of the exposure profile as our traditional TWA PELs have targeted. In the absence of specific guidance, it is reasonable to set a Long-term Average Occupational Exposure Limit (LTA OEL) at one third or less of the single shift PEL. Several statistical tests are available for determining if the true mean is less than the LTA OEL.

In summary, the EASC recommends that, as a general principle, exposures be controlled so that the 95th percentile is less than the PEL for both short-term exposure limits and full-shift TWA exposure limits. If exposures are monitored and controlled according to the EASC guidance this probability should be no more than 5%, and probably less.

Based upon the guidance in the preambles to the benzene and lead PELs and Appendix B of the formaldehyde PEL, it could be argued that such an exposure monitoring program would be considered appropriate for monitoring exposures to these substances. However, OSHA provides no similar guidance for assigning a statistical interpretation to the Z-table PELs or for the other single substance 6(b) standards. Furthermore, the sampling strategy specified by OSHA in each of the 6(b) standards will not reliably detect poorly controlled work environments.

AIHA recommends that OSHA clearly state both the immediate and long-range goals for chronic disease-agent PELs. For example, the long-range goal might be to reduce the long-term mean exposure, as averaged over, say, one or several years of exposure, to below one half or one third of the single shift PEL. The immediate goal might be to limit the probability of exceeding the PEL to 5% or less. AIHA also recommends that OSHA clearly state the goal for controlling short-term exposures when there is a short-term exposure limit or ceiling standard. For example, the target might be to limit within-shift exposure variation so that the probability of exceeding a short-term exposure limit or ceiling standard is no more than 5% or 1%, respectively.

Industrial hygienists could then design performance-based exposure monitoring and data analysis schemes that are both consistent with these goals - or statistical interpretations - and based upon state-of-the-art practices. Data collected, analyzed, and interpreted under such an exposure monitoring program would constitute "compelling evidence," as mentioned in formaldehyde standard, for demonstrating to OSHA that exposures are routinely controlled.

4. OSHA should adopt a peer-reviewed guideline for the derivation of PELs. AIHA believes that PELs must be based on the best scientific information available and must include a well-documented critical evaluation of the supporting information. Appropriate uncertainty factors also must be applied to compensate for the inherent uncertainties in the existing data and extrapolation to human populations.

Need for Peer Reviewed Guideline: A peer-reviewed guideline for the derivation of PELs is needed to provide consistency. Such a guideline could also be used by the private sector to derive occupational exposure limits for agents that do not have legal or consensus standards. The guideline should address data collection and evaluation, identification of the critical endpoint, methodology or model selection in deriving the limit, and documentation requirements. Criteria for the selection of an 8-hr. TWA, STEL, and Ceiling Limit should be clearly established. Likewise, criteria for the designation of a skin notation should also be delineated.

Alternative Work Schedules: Since alternative work schedules have become more commonplace, they should be addressed in the PEL guidance. The body of knowledge concerning risk assessment and management will continue to grow as a result of strong research efforts in this area. Therefore, the methods used in establishing PELs must be part of a dynamic process, inclusive of innovative improvements as they are verified and peer-reviewed. There is a particular need to incorporate means whereby inherent uncertainties in the risk assessment process can be addressed.

Use of Best Available Data: PELs should be based on the best available data concerning relevant toxicity and exposure potential. Information sources can include on-line databases, standard texts, and solicitation of potentially important unpublished data from sources such as manufacturers and users. Every effort should be made to obtain original references for all data since review articles and other secondary references frequently contain errors or significant omissions of relevant information. Furthermore, it is often difficult to evaluate the technical merits of data cited in secondary references. Unpublished, confidential company reports should not be used unless a publicly available summary can be provided which contains sufficient detail as to the methods used, results observed, and conclusions drawn, so as to permit a critical review of the adequacy of the report.

Data to be collected include physicochemical properties, toxicity, toxicokinetics, toxicodynamics, nuisance properties (e.g., odor), and exposure and population parameters. Available toxicity data vary widely in nature and quality from agent to agent. Therefore, all available data should be reviewed and their quality and value as a basis for setting a PEL determined. Several aspects of study design and reporting must be considered when assessing the quality of toxicity data; guidance is available from many sources.

The toxicity data documented for each PEL should include a summary of pertinent human and animal data, genotoxicity data, summaries of cancer hazard and reproductive hazard evaluations, where available, and a summary of pertinent metabolism/toxicokinetic data. Some chemicals may cause effects in animals at inordinately high doses, under unusual exposure conditions, or under other unique circumstances. The relevance of such information should be considered. If available data on human experience establish results different from those obtained in animals, the human data should take precedence. Human experience should be emphasized to the extent credible data are available.

The goal of the toxicity data review is the delineation of all adverse effects relevant to the setting of a PEL. The rationale for a PEL may be derived from epidemiology data or human experience. When human data are lacking, the PEL will be derived from animal data. The basis for the PEL should generally be the adverse effect and associated NOAEL/LOAEL occurring first on the dose-response curve; this is referred to as the critical effect. The NOAEL is defined as the exposure level at which there is no statistically or biologically significant increases in frequency or severity of adverse effects between the exposed population and its appropriate control. Effects may be produced at this level, but they are not considered to be adverse. The LOAEL is the lowest exposure level in a study or group of studies that produces statistically or biologically significant increases in frequency or severity of adverse effects between the exposed population and its appropriate control. The manner by which other adverse effects are prevented by protecting against the effect chosen as the rationale for the PEL should be indicated in the documentation.

A risk assessment methodology to characterize the dose-response curve and derive the PEL should be selected based on the nature of the effect and quality of data. Several quantitative risk assessment methods exist that can be applied to low dose risk estimation of carcinogenicity; these include linear,

mechanistic, tolerance distribution, time-to-tumor and biologically motivated models. An uncertainty factor approach would be appropriate for nongenotoxic effects where exposure thresholds can be demonstrated. Limitations of the traditional uncertainty factor method in PEL setting include lack of risk comparisons, limited consideration of the slope of the dose-response curve, and use of NOELs that are dependent on test sample size and therefore, may not be highly certain. In order to address some of these limitations, different models could be considered to develop the dose-response curve. For example, the Benchmark Dose approach, which is a statistical confidence limit on a dose corresponding to a specific increase in the response rate over the background rate, may address these shortcomings in some instances. This method utilizes the entire dose-response curve, does not require that a NOAEL be identified, and allows estimation of risk at multiple exposure levels.

Comparative toxicokinetic data should be utilized when available to help address uncertainty related to interspecies extrapolation. Generally, if credible human data exist, minimal uncertainty factors should be applied as compared to situations where only animal data are available. The seriousness and reversibility of the critical effect should also be considered in developing an appropriate uncertainty factor. For example, a lower factor may be used where the PEL is based on avoidance of localized, reversible, sensory irritation whereas higher factors should be applied where the critical effect is systemic in nature. Default assumptions should only be used in the absence of adequate data and should be scientifically defensible. Supporting documentation for the risk assessment and PEL derivation should include a discussion of uncertainties identified and means by which they are addressed. Identified uncertainties should drive future research projects.

Summaries of Studies: Summaries of those studies determined to be adequate and appropriate for use in setting PELs should be included in the PEL documentation. Those data deemed valuable from studies judged inadequate will also be included with appropriate discussion of study inadequacies and data limitations; these data may be considered supporting in nature but should not be the basis of the PEL.

5. Employers have a responsibility to assess the risks to the health of their workers and adequately control worker exposures to hazardous substances or agents for which there are no PELs. Employees must be fully consulted in the development of these risk assessments and informed of the results. Tools such as occupational hazard banding, a hierarchy of OELs approach and risk based quantitative analyses should be employed where appropriate when PELs are not available.

AIHA recognizes that even a streamlined and simplified PEL rule-making process will be a relatively slow process that will never be able to generate exposure limits for all of the substances that are likely to present a health risk to employees. The biggest issue for all OEL-setting bodies is the lack of minimal toxicological data on most chemicals or mixtures, adequate resources to interpret existing data sets, and the ongoing need to protect workers during the consistent introduction of new chemicals being launched into the marketplace. In the absence of these limits, employers still have a responsibility to control exposure to protect against material impairment to health or diminished functional capacity.

To ensure workers are adequately protected, it is the AIHA's position that employers formally document an assessment of risks created by any work and the means for controlling these risks. This involves evaluating the hazards of the substances or agents (their anticipated health effects, likely target organs, and the synergistic effects which may occur from combined or sequential exposures to other substances), the likely routes of exposure (inhalation, dermal, ingestion, or subcutaneous), the nature of the extent to which work groups could be exposed (the duration, frequency, and intensity of exposure), and the effectiveness of controls. These risk assessments must be developed in consultation with and

the involvement of affected employees. They should be reviewed regularly and whenever there is a significant management change in operations, health information or processes in general.

In some instances there may be sufficient information available from manufacturers, suppliers, the occupational medicine literature, industrial toxicology or other disciplines to set a self-imposed provisional working standard. In these situations, employers should develop recommended exposure limits using the best scientific information available exposure monitoring data to confirm compliance with these limits. These provisional exposure limits and information about effective controls should be provided to users of these substances, whether employees or customers.

Responsible product stewardship and Corporate Social Responsibility suggests that employers should observe OELs for the non-PEL substances present in their workplaces that may present a risk to their employees as a result of exposure. These limits could be based on RELs, TLVs, or WEELs or on the recommendations of the supplier or manufacturer of the substance. AIHA supports OSHA's recommendation that employers consider using the alternative OELs values found in the published Annotated PEL Tables online.

Ideally, OELs should be risk-based exposure values derived from human experience or toxicological studies. Where such data are not available, structure activity relationships (SAR) may be used as a last resort. AIHA recommends that such risk-based exposure limits, together with explicit operational precautionary and control statements, be included as part of an enhanced hazard communication program that has as its core an "Operational Safety Data Sheet (SDS)." Operational SDSs provide the prescribed procedures, the results to be recorded and the criteria for defining adjectives such as "use a suitable respirator" or "employ good local ventilation.'' In practice, however, the burden of these requirements would fall on the producers of non-PEL substances (generally larger companies) since they would be the first employer to have such substances in their workplace and are presently required to furnish an SDS to their customers. Adoption of these recommendations would be economically efficient since it would internalize the cost of providing the health protection data needed by the multiple users of non-PEL substances on the relatively few suppliers or importers of substances.

For some substances, medical examinations would be a critical element of worker protection. Employers need to establish programs to perform appropriate medical tests when needed. The principles obligating employers to perform workplace risk assessments have been the framework of worker health legislation in many countries, particularly within the European Union. These requirements would logically be a part of any comprehensive health and safety program standard issued by OSHA. The AIHA recommends this approach be adopted to supplement programs for updating Permissible Exposure Limits.

Many Industrial Hygienists perform exposure risk assessments and risk management using alternative strategies such as occupational hazard banding when PELs or other OELs do not exist. This process has been successfully used for over 20 years in the pharmaceutical industry where OELs rarely exist. OEBs can be developed with minimal data, highlight areas where data are missing, support the definition of OEL-ranges for families of materials, support chemical hazard identification by structural activity relationships and functionality, and provide a screening tool for the development of OELs. NIOSH's initiative for a unified approach of developing OEBs using the hazard banding techniques will standardize the way hazards are evaluated. It also provides a roadmap for organizations, OSHA included, to recommend a hazard category and subsequent risk control strategies.

Risk based exposure limits apply mathematical modeling to existing toxicology data to estimate a true predicted level of risk. The information derived would better inform all stakeholders of the underpinning, meaning and certainty of our limits.

And finally, a growing segment of our profession has embraced, both here and abroad, a "Hierarchy of OELs" approach to selecting limits (attached) which incorporates occupational hazard banding, prescriptive OELs (such as NCELs, DNELs, etc), provisional OELs (i.e. company OELs) and traditional OELs (i.e. PELs, TLVs, WEELs, RELs, etc) when they exist. AIHA has supported these alternative strategies as a suite of critical tools for well over 10 years now.



6. PELs should be consistent across occupational populations and should be accepted by other federal agencies when the goal is protecting occupational health.

PELs are derived for use by occupational health professionals to protect the health of workers in their environments. To accomplish this, certain assumptions are made. The population at risk is assumed to be healthy and ranging in age from 16 to 72 years. Exposures are usually periodic, averaging forty hours or more per week. There may be susceptible or hypersensitive individuals for which the PEL will not prevent adverse effects. Thus, the population that the PELs are intended for still may exhibit illness or injury, particularly when technical and economic feasibility concerns modify a health endpoint to a higher PEL.

Environmental vs Occupational Limits: PELs, TLVs and WEELs at times have been inappropriately applied in public health situations and not applied in the occupational sector alone (e.g., control of air pollution exposures for the general public). Significant differences in general population exposure conditions and protection goals eliminate the value in applying occupational limits to the control of environmental exposures for the general public. Most often, the goal of public health is the elimination of risk to a population of varied ages and varying degrees of health and susceptibility to adverse insults.

In the occupational environment, susceptible individuals can be protected via a hierarchy of controls. This hierarchy of controls is generally not available within a community. It is neither appropriate nor scientifically sound to use occupational limits in non-occupational applications and vice versa.

Consistency in Application Regardless of Jurisdiction or Control Feasibility: AIHA believes that PELs must be consistent across occupational populations including, for example, manufacturing operations and office environments. PELs are health-based levels, which must take into account the common finding that a single chemical can have varying adverse effects at different exposures or doses. For example, a chemical may be a potential systemic chronic health hazard at one dose level and also be a transient sensory irritant at a different exposure or dose level. AIHA believes that the development of a single PEL must take into account all known adverse effects associated with that chemical. PELs must be set to protect against the lowest documented effect level based on sound science, thereby affording protection against effects occurring at higher dose levels. AIHA is opposed to the establishment of multiple "tiered" PELs intended to be applied in different occupational settings. To ensure consistency across the occupational work force, PELs must be derived to protect against adverse effects across either single or both gender populations.

Health based PELs should be set without regard to control feasibility in an industry or workplace, but not set where it cannot be measured or analyzed. It is true that workplace exposures may vary between industries, but it is also true that an agent's adverse health effects remain constant. Since the ultimate goal of a PEL is to control adverse effects, it is inconsistent to derive limits for varying industries based on control technology. In instances where engineering control is not feasible, enforcement directives should allow compliance via additional alternate control strategies (e.g., administrative controls or respirators as a last choice). Because these control strategies, especially the use of respirators, are often less effective than engineering controls, they should be used under the guidance of occupational health professionals.

Federal Agency Agreement to Accept Common PELs: *T*o further ensure consistency, when the goal is protecting occupational health OSHA PELs should be accepted by other federal agencies. Protecting public health in federal agencies is different than an occupational environment. OSHA's primary goal is occupational safety and health and as such the agency is in the best position to understand, evaluate and promulgate appropriate occupational exposure standards.

Updated, Reviewed and Approved by Board of Directors: October 8, 2015
Previously Adopted by Board of Directors: 1998, 2002, 2009, 2015

References

1. Henschler. D. The concept of occupational exposure limits. Sci. Total Environ. 101:916 (1991).

2. Hatch, T. F. Criteria for hazardous exposure limits. Arch. Environ. Health. 27:231-235 (1973)

3. Paustenbach, D. OSHA's Program for Updating the Permissible Exposure Limits (PELs): Can Risk Assessment Help "Move the Ball Forward?" in Risk in Perspective, Volume 5, Number 1, 1997, Harvard Center for Risk Analysis.

4. Tuggle, R.M.: The NIOSH decision scheme. American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal 42:493-498 (1981).

5. EPA (United States Environmental Protection Agency) 1990. Interim Methods for the Development of Inhalation Reference Concentrations. U.S. EPA/600/8-90/066A.

6. Galer, D.M., Leung, H.W., Sussman, R.G., and Trozos, R.J. 1992. Scientific and Practical Considerations for the Development of Occupational Exposure Limits (OELs) for Chemical Substances. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology 15:291-306.

7. Johnnsen, F. R. (1990). Risk assessment of carcinogenic and noncarcinogenic chemicals. Critical Reviews in Toxicology 20:341-367.

8. Rosenthal, I. and Icnatowski. A.J. The Operational Material Safety Data Sheet - Key to the Effectiveness of a Generic Approach to the Control of Health and Safety Risks, Parts I and II. Appl. Occup. Environ. Hyg. 8:708-720 (1993).

9. Gardner, R.J. and Oldershaw, P.J. Development of Pragmatic Exposure Control Concentrations Based on Packaging Risk Phrases. Annals of Occupational Hygiene 35:57-59 (1991).

General Comments from AIHA Volunteer Groups

In addition to providing the AIHA white paper/position statement on the issue of Permissible Exposure Limits AIHA requested our Volunteer Groups to submit comments in response to the OSHA Request for Information (RFI). The following comments should not be considered official comments from AIHA; but rather general comments submitted by members of three AIHA Volunteer Groups:

Volunteer Group 1 – AIHA Exposure Control Banding Committee (ECBC)

Question IV.C.1 : Should OSHA consider greater use of process oriented regulations, such as regulations on abrasive blasting, welding or degreasing as an approach to health standards? Should an approach be combined with a control banding approach?

Response: Many employers use similar unit operations or tasks to manufacture a product or provide a service. In many cases, the hazards and exposures associated with these tasks have been evaluated and control approaches have been developed and validated. Rather than promulgate new health standards for thousands of unregulated chemicals, OSHA could issue voluntary task based control guidelines or they could require employers to comply with process oriented regulations that are similar to the standards OSHA has already developed for abrasive blasting, welding, degreasing and, most recently, lead and silica in construction.

When they developed the lead and silica in construction standards OSHA recognized that the collection of initial exposure monitoring data at an ever-changing construction site would be difficult. Therefore, the lead (1926.62) and silica (notice of proposed rulemaking) standards require employers to protect employees with defined control strategies for selected tasks during the assessment of exposure (lead) or in lieu of initial monitoring (silica). Essentially OSHA assigned "control bands" to selected construction tasks. The bands were based on anticipated exposures and the effectiveness of validated controls. Appropriately employers were provided resources such as "Controlling Silica Exposures in Construction" (OSHA 3362-05) to assist them with implementing these controls.

Process oriented regulations are especially attractive in settings where quantitative data is difficult to collect. Examples include: machining with metalworking fluids, working with nano size particles, spraying 2-part polyurethane foam, welding, soldering with a flux that releases complex thermal decomposition products, and remediating mold in a workplace. Employers frequently overlook the chronic health effects associated with these and other processes because chronic health effects are not immediately recognized. Process oriented regulations insure that chronic health hazards are addressed in risk assessments. ANSI, NIOSH, OSHA, various governmental, professional, and trade organizations have developed best practice guidance resources for these and other settings. Implementation of the guidance insures that workers are protected.

Risk assessments in industry target high profile health hazards and often ignore a common tenet of pick "low hanging fruit". Some low and medium risks can be controlled very easily yet these are not considered by systemic design; this can be addressed with control banding.

The UK HSE demonstrated the benefits of control banding through its COSHH initiatives for small and medium sized employers. In addition to its 'generic control guidance sheets' COSHH Essentials has developed multiple industry-specific 'direct advice sheets'. The "best practice" guidance documents address multiple production and service industries. The recommended controls provide general design guidance so that employers can construct effective controls. The task based guidance documents identify a best practice for controlling the hazard, provide illustrated details on effective operation and maintenance techniques and offer additional checklists for supervisors and workers.
Additional process oriented "best practice guidance" could be developed with input from manufacturers. For example, in Europe, manufacturers of high use chemicals are expected to provide "Tier 1 & Tier 2" guidance (exposure assessment and risk characterization of tasks). Since the HSE introduced COSHH Essentials, multiple enhanced control banding models have been introduced. These "next generation" CB models and resources such as the Advanced Reach Tool, will be used by manufacturers to develop exposure scenarios. These scenarios describe the operating conditions and risk management measures that have been identified by the supplier. As a result, end users will have better information on the hazards of chemicals and guidance on how to use them safely.
As part of an employer's Injury and Illness Prevention Programs, OSHA could require employers to conduct a Job Hazard Analysis, which could include reviewing (and possibly implementing) the available best practice guidance for specific processes. OSHA &/or NIOSH could continuously publish these best practices as suggestions or examples for employers to utilize. Employers would be encouraged/expected to implement the best practice guidance unless they can demonstrate that the exposure potential variables in their setting reduce risk (e.g. limited frequency, small quantities etc.). Enforcement in these situations could identify if best practice controls are in place, maintained and appear to work. If there is deviation from best practice controls then task and exposure assessment reports should be developed by competent persons to identify conditions and parameters of control.

Question V.A.4: Are there other acceptable methods that can be used to develop hazard information for multiple chemicals within a group?

Response: The control banding approach builds on currently acceptable methods for development of hazard information and control. The Hazard Band approach utilizes traditional toxicology information such as chronic toxicity, acute toxicity, carcinogenicity, irritation, and sensitization. The Control Banding technique supports traditional industrial hygiene methods for control including containment, ventilation, work practices, and personal protective equipment. The traditional tools of including elimination, substitution and modification are also supported within the banding methodology.

A specific other method that utilizes these principles include Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety Fact Sheet on Control Banding approach, German Chemical Management Guide, COSHH Essentials, and tools provided by the International Labour Organization.

Question V.B.8: How could OSHA use the information generated under HazCom 2012 to pursue means of managing and controlling chemical exposures in an approach other than substance-by-substance regulation?

Response: As OSHA notes on its "Transitioning to Safer Chemicals" website ", informed substitution and alternatives assessment are key elements of an effective chemical management system that best protects workers. Employers should be able to readily identify high-hazard chemicals with information generated under HazCom 2012. They will recognize that products with the signal word "Danger" are more hazardous than products with the signal word "Warning". In addition, they will appreciate that within each hazard class, chemicals with a category 1 designation are more hazardous that chemicals with 2, 3 or 4 designations. Employers and employees can use the information from SDSs to make informed substitution decisions and identify which potential chemical exposures are of greatest concern. NIOSH's Occupational Exposure Banding project should help employers use data from SDSs to categorize chemicals into hazard bands.

Question V.B.9: How could such an approach satisfy legal requirements to reduce significant risk of material impairment and for technological and economic feasibility?

Response: The HazCom 2012 standard with GHS criteria for the classification and labeling of chemicals greatly enhances the original hazard communication standard. The AIHA Exposure Control Banding Committee (ECBC) recommends that the standard for hazard characterization as a starting point for health hazard banding and occupational exposure banding of chemicals.

In light of several regulatory actions and demonstrated inability for an industry to handle chemicals and health hazards an industry association decided to develop a control banding system similar to the ILO Chemical Control Toolkit. The industry has some very sophisticated chemistry but the health aspects of chemicals are often overlooked and the ability to associate a health hazard from an SDS to a health hazard category was may be difficult for field level workers.

Control banding is a risk assessment technique with smarter science based inputs and thoughtful well-conceived outputs. Risk assessments in other cases are as good as the people around providing

input into the assessment. Qualified occupational safety & health professionals are the most qualified to address especially hazardous environments and conditions.

Question V.B.10: Please describe your experience in using health hazard and/or control banding to address exposures to chemicals in the workplace.

Response: The ECBC acknowledges that chemicals are introduced at a rate that exceeds occupational exposure limit (OEL) development. The recently proposed NIOSH Occupational Exposure Banding process will be useful to develop risk guidance for those chemicals. As noted in OSHA Exhibit #127 and the RFI (page 61415), the proposed OEB process classifies chemicals into one of five bands and "includes a three-tiered evaluation system based on the availability of toxicological data to define a range of concentrations for controlling chemical exposures."

Members of the AIHA ECBC have had a variety of experiences using health hazard and/or control banding to address exposures to chemicals in the workplace such as chemical manufacturing, general manufacturing, oil & gas, research & development, academia, healthcare, defense, biosafety, and services. All have had positive experiences classifying hazards, observing others classifying hazards, and having workers with various levels of education understand the resultant controls.
One AIHA ECBC member presented a series of control banding workshops for joint labor/management teams from a variety of workplaces. The participants learned how to use one CB model, the United Kingdom (UK) Health and Safety Executive's Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Essentials Toolkit. After the initial training program the investigators used follow-up workshops, questionnaires and site visit data to evaluate the training curriculum and assess the utility and effectiveness of this CB model. Although they thought that there was considerable room for improvement, the participants appreciated the fact that the model promoted a discussion of risk between workers and managers. The participants successfully used the model to identify high hazard chemicals and they observed that industry-specific "direct advice" guidance was valuable, especially when COSHH Essentials' generic chemical by chemical CB approach proved difficult. (Bracker, JOEH, May 2009). This ECBC member continues to teach small employers about the value of hazard banding strategies and industry-specific "direct advice" resources in her capacity as a health consultant for small employers through OSHA's 21D program.

Health hazard banding and control banding are comprehensively being applied at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) and its successes are being shared and implemented nationally and internationally. This Occupational and Environmental Risk Management (OERM) is based entirely on banding strategies, reflecting the need for clear and consistent communication of risk within the Environment Health and Safety (EHS) professions was considered essential for achieving prevention of work-related risks. Utilizing fundamental Industrial Hygiene (IH) principles, a Risk Level Based Management System (RLBMS) was developed to deliver the most elusive toll necessary for success; risk communication within and between our EHS professions. With a singular EHS risk communication construct, a comprehensive OERM program has been built. The RLBMS is based on the success of control banding applications internationally that are reflected in the expansive reference list submitted as a response to V.2 of this RFI. Bringing together the basic banding strategies, the RLBMS has now been expanded well beyond potential workplace chemical exposures and has been expanded to cover all IH regulatory requirements for chemical, physical, and biological agents within a Risk Assessment and Control (RAC) database. As an outcome, the utility of using health hazard banding as part of the initial qualitative risk assessment process has proved beneficial

in not only standardizing controls, it also prioritizes where and when quantitative monitoring needs to be performed. Therefore, health hazard and control banding has proved itself as an essential commodity for a comprehensive IH program. In addition, the simplification of risk communication through banding strategies also provides an essential de-confliction of multidisciplinary controls for an individual task. This banding process provides to the workers a simple, clear, and concise guidance on how to reduce risk, achieve exposure prevention, and have worker-based feedback and improvement on a daily basis. Its success has also built collaboration between both Los Alamos National Laboratory and LLNL to create a common risk assessment process within the RLBMS. Currently, a comprehensive Work Planning and Control (WP&C) system is being implemented based on a singular, multidisciplinary RAC database that expands the banding strategies for the Industrial Safety, Health Physics, Environmental Analyst, Explosives Safety, Ergonomics, and Fire Protection professions. The WP&C and RAC database are established as compliant with OHSAS 18001, ISO 14001, and ISO 9001. With RLBMS and this comprehensive example of applying banding strategies to reduce worker and environmental exposures, the ability to combine an Occupational Safety and Health Management System (OHSMS) with an Environmental Management System (EMS) brings the opportunity for a new OERM process, but also a new vision for an example of how OSHA and EPA can work together on a singular EHS regulations.

Hazard Assessment and Health Hazard Banding; After the hazards are derived and identified from the prescribed tasks in a concise scope of work, each of the EHS disciplines performs a documented hazard assessment using health hazard banding for each of their hazards in the RAC database. This procedure utilizes the RLBMS that divides each hazard into four categories that are presented, lowest to highest, as Risk Level 1 (RL1) to RL4. EHS professionals can use both example tasks at each RL or assessments for a given hazard that was previously completed by their fellow disciplines.

Risk Assessment; Once the RL is derived to determine relative severity of a given hazard, the components of exposure probability are then obtained from the work scope and documented to complete a qualitative risk assessment.

Control Banding; Each hazard's RLs are paired with commensurate controls following the traditional IH hierarchy in source documents that are developed by the Subject Matter Expert. Using IH as an example, there are 35 separate hazard source documents that include US OSHA related materials. All this information is automatically filled in within the RAC database and then modified to the work scope at hand by the discipline. This provides an indirect hazard-to-control banding approach. Classic control banding tools are also used within this process, including the BAuA EMKG toolkit for chemicals without ACGIH TLVs or OSHA PELS and the quantitatively validated CB NanoTool. In addition, there are RL derivation tools for oxygen deficiency, toxic gas, and welding. All RL3 and RL4 hazard outcomes have required follow-up actions, including classic chemical exposure assessment monitoring, and RL2 has periodic validation protocol.

Question V.B.12: How can OSHA most effectively use the concepts of health hazard and control banding in developing health standards?

Response: The NIOSH OEB framework and tool under development are being subjected to multiple rounds of internal and external validity testing. The completion of this validated framework and tool could assist OSHA in assessing chemical hazards, prioritizing them, and determining a priority order for potential regulation or guidance. OSHA could also consider a novel approach of recommending

OEBs in conjunction with a comprehensive safety management system. This approach could complement the current health-based standard approach.

Question V.B.11.: Are additional studies available that have examined the effectiveness of health hazard and control banding strategies in protecting workers?

Response: There are several articles that describe studies conducted to examine the effectiveness of health hazard and control banding strategies in protecting workers. Examples are listed below:

- Paik, Y. Samuel, Zalk, David M., Swuste, Paul. Application of a Pilot Control Band Tool for Risk Level Assessment and Control of Nanoparticle Exposure, Annals of Occupational Hygiene, Vol. 52, No. 6, pp. 419-428, published 16 July 2008.
- David M. Zalk & Deborah Imel Nelson. History and Evolution of Control Banding: A Review, Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene, Vol.5 Issue 5 2008, published 25 March 2008.
- Haruo Hashimoto, et. al. Evaluation of Control Banding Method – Comparison with Measurement-based Comprehensive Risk Assessment, Journal of Occupational Health, Volume 49 - 2007, No 6, Pages 482-492.
- ABPI (1995). Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry (ABPI): *Guidance on setting in-house occupational exposure limits for airborne therapeutic substances and their intermediates*. London:
- ACGIH (1991). American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH). Documentation Of The Threshold Limit Values And Biological Exposure Indices, Sixth Edition, Cincinnati, OH.
- ACGIH (2008) Control Banding: Issues and Opportunities. A report of the ACGIH Exposure/Control Banding Task Force, ACGIH Publishing, Cincinnati, OH
- Acheson ED, Hadfield EH, Macbeth RG (1967). Carcinoma of the nasal cavity and accessory sinuses in woodworkers. Lancet, 1:311-312.
- Acheson ED (1976). Nasal cancer in the furniture and boot and shoe manufacturing industries. Preventive Medicine, 5:295-315.
- Ackoff RL (1999). Re-creating the corporation, a design of organizations for the 21st Century. Oxford University Press. NY, NY, pgs 63-80.
- Adelmann K (2001). *Chemical Safety and Development.* Society for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) [German], 1-10.
- AIHA (2007) Guidance for conducting control banding analyses. American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA) Control Banding Working Group, AIHA Publications, Fairfax, VA.
- Aitken RA, Bassan A, Friedrichs S, Hankin SM, Hansen SF, Holmqvist J, et al. Specific advice on exposure assessment and hazard/risk characterization for nanomaterials under REACH (RIP- oN 3). Final Project Report REACH-NANO Consult-ON3FPR1FINAL. 2011
- Albers JT, Li Y, Lemasters G, Sprague S, Stinson R, Bhattacharya A (1997) An ergonomic education and evaluation program for apprentice carpenters. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* 32(6), 641-646.

- Ale B, Bellamy L, Baksteen H, Damen M, Goossens L, Hale A, et al. (2008). Accidents in the construction industry in the Netherlands: an analysis of accident reports using storybuilder. Reliable engineering and system safety. 93;1523-1533.
- Andersen HC, Andersen I, Solgaard J (1977). Nasal cancers, symptoms and upper airway function in wood workers. British Journal of Industrial Medicine. 34:201-207.
- Aneziris ON, Papzpglou IA, Baksteen H, Mud M, et al. (2008). Quantified risk assessment for fall from height. Safety Science, 46:198-220.
- Annals (1998) Special issue: Exposure limits and control banding. Ann Occupational Hygiene 42(6):355-407.
- Annals (2003) Chemical control in small and medium sized enterprises, control banding and other approaches. Papers from a meeting in London, November 2002. Ann Occupational Hygiene 47(7):531-577.
- ANSI (2000) Risk assessment and reduction: a guide to estimate, evaluate and reduce risks associated with machine tools. Association for Manufacturing Technology (B11, TR3-2000). McLean, VA
- Armstrong TJ, et al. (1993). A conceptual model for work-related neck and upper-limb musculoskeletal disorders, *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment, and Health* 19:73-74.
- ASTM International (2007) *Terminology for Nanotechnology*. West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM International, E2456-06.
- Bałazy A, Toivola M, Reponen T, Podgorski A et al. (2006). Based Performance Evaluation of N95 Filtering-Facepiece Respirators Challenged with Nanoparticles. Ann Occupational Hygiene 50(3):259-269.
- Baker EA, Israel, BA, Schurman SJ (1994). A participatory approach to worksite health promotion. *Journal of Ambulatory Care Management* 17(2), 68-81.
- Balsat A, Mairiaux P, De Graeve J (2002). A global approach for assessing and managing chemical risks at the workplace: Advantages, limits and perspectives. *Presented at 1ICBW*, London, 4-5 November.
- Balsat A, de Graeve J, Mairiaux P (2003). A structured strategy for assessing chemical risks, suitable for small and medium-sized enterprises. Ann Occupational Hygiene 47: 549-56.
- Balsat A, Mairiaux P, de Graeve J (2004). Control banding for assessing chemical risks Belgian companies experience. *Presented at 2ICBW,* 1-2 March 2004, Cincinnati, OH.
- Baluyutt R, et al. (1995). Use of visual perception in estimating static postural stresses: magnitudes and sources of errors. *Ergonomics* 38(9):1841-1850.
- Bellamy LJ, Ale BJM, Geyer TAW, Goossens LHJ, Hale AR, et al. (2007). Storybuilder - A tool for the analysis of accident reports. *Reliability engineering & system safety, 92*, 735-744.
- Bentley T, Hide D, Tappin D, et al. (2006). Investigating risk factors for slips, trips and falls in New Zealand residential construction using incident-centered and incident-independent techniques. Ergon. 49: 62-77.

- Bernard BP (1997). Elements of ergonomics programs: a primer based on workplace evaluations of musculoskeletal disorders. Cincinnati, National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health. US Department of Health and Human Services Publication Number 97 – 117.
- Blackadder D and Lederman Rill, (1971). A handbook of unit operations. Academic Press, London.
- BLS (1994). Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS): Annual Survey of Occupational Injuries and Illnesses* (US Department of Labor).
- BLS (2007). Bureau of Labor Statistics occupational injury, illness, and fatality data http://www.bls.gov/news.release/cfoi.toc.htm
- Bohr PC, Evan off BA, Wolf LD (1997). Implementing participatory ergonomics teams among health care workers. American Journal of Industrial Medicine 32(3), 190-196.
- Borm P, Houba R, Linker F (2008). Omgaan met nanodeeltjes op de werkvloer. Survey naar goede praktijken in omgaan met nanomaterialen in de Nederlandse industrie en kennisinstellingen. (Dealing with nanoparticles at the shop floor). Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment and Ministry of Housing, Spacial planning and Environment
- Bracker AL Morse TF Simcox NJ (2009). Training health and safety committees to use control banding: lessons learned and opportunities for the United States. J Occupational Env Hygiene, 6:307-314.
- Briton LA, Blot WJ, Becker JA (1984). A Case Control Study of Cancer Of The Nasal Cavity And Paranasal Sinuses. Am. J. of Epid. 119(6):896.
- Brooke IM (1998). A UK scheme to help small firms control health risks from chemicals: toxicological considerations. *Annals of Occupational Hygiene.* 42:377-390.
- Brouwer, D. H. (2012). Control banding approaches for nanomaterials. *The Annals of Occupational Hygiene, 56*(5), 506-514.
- Buchanan D, Cressey P, Hiba JC, Scmid F, Wilson J (1998). Work organization and ergonomics. Geneva, International Labour Office.
- Buckle P, Devereux J (1999). Work-related neck and upper limb musculoskeletal disorders. Bilbao, European Agency for Safety and Health at Work. 114p.
- Burdorf A. (1992) Exposure assessment of risk factors for disorders of the back in occupational epidemiology. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment, and Health* 18(4), 1-9.
- Burdorf A, van der Beek, A (1999). Exposure assessment strategies for work-related risk factors for musculoskeletal disorders. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment, and Health* 25(4), 25-30.
- Burstyn I and Teschke K (1999). Studying the determinants of exposure: a review of methods. *Am. Ind. Hygiene. Assoc. J.* 60:57-72.
- Cable J (2006). Nanotech expert calls for more investment in EHS research. *Occupational Hazards*, November 2006.
- Canadian Standards Association. (2011). *Selection, Use, and Care of Respirators*. Z94-4.11.
- Canadian Standards Association. (2011). CAN/GCSB/CSA-Z1610-11. *Protection of First Responders From Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Events*.

- Castranova V (1998). Particles and the airways: Basic biological mechanisms of pulmonary pathogenicity. *Applied Occupational and Environmental Hygiene*; 13(8): 613-616.
- Casuccio G, Ogle R, Wahl L, Pauer R. (2009). Worker and Environmental Assessment of Potential Unbound Engineered Nanoparticle Releases- Phase II Final Report: Preliminary Control Band Development. RJ Lee Group Inc & E.O. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. http://www2.lbl.gov/ehs/esg/Reports/assets/Phase%20II%20Final%20Report2009.pdf
- Casuccio G, Ogle R, Bunker K, Rickabaugh K, Wahl L, Roberts T, Paur R. (2010). Worker and Environmental Assessment of Potential Unbound Engineered Nanoparticle Releases- Phase III Final Report: Validation of Preliminary Control Band Assignments. RJ Lee Group Inc & E.O. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. http://www2.lbl.gov/ehs/esg/Reports/assets/Phase%20III%20Final%20Report2010.pdf
- CCPS (1989). Centre for Chemical Process safety (CCPS) Guidelines for chemical process quantitative risk analysis. American Institute of Chemical Engineers, New York
- CDC (1993). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC): *Biosafety in Microbiological and Biomedical Laboratories.* 3rd Rev. J.Y. Richmond and R.W. McKinney eds. [HHS pub. No. (CDC) 93-8395] Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office 1993. pp. 6-43, 138-145.
- CDM (2007). Great Britain regulatory framework in Construction (Design and Management) Regulations, 6 April 2007. http://www.hse.gov.uk/construction/cdm.htm
- Cherrie J and Schneider T (1999) Validation of a new method for structured subjective assessment of past concentrations. *Ann. Occupational. Hygiene.* 43:235-245.
- Chi CF, Chang TC, Ting HI. (2005). Accident patterns and prevention measures for fatal occupational falls in the construction industry. Appl Ergon. 36(4):391-400.
- CIA (1992). Chemical Industries Association (CIA): *Safe handling of potentially carcinogenic aromatic amines and nitro-compounds.* London: CIA.
- CIA (1993). Safe handling of colourants 2. London: CIA.
- CIA (1997). *The control of substances hazardous to health regulations: guidance on allocating occupational exposure bands. (Regulation 7).* London: CIA.
- CPWR (2004). Silica Hazard Alert http://www.cpwr.com/pdfs/pubs/hazard_alerts/KFsilica.pdf
- Collis E and Greenwood M (1921). The health of the industrial worker. Churchill, London.
- Cook R (2007). Simplifying the creation and use of the risk matrix. In: Redmill F. and Anderson T. (Eds.) Improvements in systems safety. Springer. London.
- Coleman S, Zalk DM (2014). Environmental risk communication through qualitative risk assessment. Toxics; 2:346-63.
- Corlett EN, Madeley SJ, Manenica I (1979). Posture targeting: a technique for recording working postures. *Ergonomics* 22(3)357-366.
- Cory H (1999). The effects of production changes on the musculoskeletal disorders in Brazil and South America. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics* 25, 103-104.
- Coyle IR, Sleeman SD, Adams N (1995). Safety climate. J of Safety Res 26:247-54.
- Crabtree HC, Hart D, Thomas MC, Witham BH, McKenzie IG, Smith CP (1991). Carcinogenic ranking of aromatic amine and nitro compounds. *Mutation Res*. 264:155-162.

- Creaser W (2008). Prevention through design (PtD) safe design from an Australian perspective. J Saf Res. 39(2):131-134.
- Croteau G, Guffey S, Flanagan M, Seixas N (2002). The Effect of Local Exhaust Ventilation Controls on Dust Exposures During Masonry Activities. AIHA Journal 63:458–467.
- De Blois (1926). Safety in the chemical industry. Annals Amer Acad Polit & Soc Sci, 123:127-131.
- De Jong AM, P Vink (2002). Participatory ergonomics applied in installation work. Appl Ergon 33(4):39-46.
- De Looze MP, IJM Urlings, P Vink, et al. (2001). Towards successful physical stress reducing products: an evaluation of seven cases. Appl Ergon 32(5):525-534.
- DEC (1988). Dutch Expert Committee (DEC) for Occupational Standards. Wood Dust [Draft Report], WGD, Voorburg, Netherlands.
- Deveau M, Chen CP, Johanson G, Krewski D, Maier A, Niven KJ, Ripple S, Schulte PA, Silk J, Urbanus JH, Zalk DM, Niemeier RW (2015). The global landscape of Occupational Exposure Limits – Implementation of principles to guide limit selection. J Occupational Environ Hygiene. (Posted July 2015 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15459624.2015.1060327)
- Doll R (1955). Mortality from lung cancer in asbestos workers. *British Journal of Industrial Medicine*; 12:81-86.
- Donaldson K, Li X, MacNee W (1998). Ultrafine (nanometer) particle mediated lung injury. *Journal of Aerosol Science*; 29(5-6): 553-560.
- Donaldson K, Aitken R, Tran L, Stone V, et al. (2006). Carbon Nanotubes: A review of their properties in relation to pulmonary toxicology and workplace safety. Toxicol Sci 92(1):5-22.
- EC (1998). European Commission (EC): Council Directive 98/24/EC on the protection of the health and safety of workers from risks related to chemical agents at work. *Off. J. Eur. Commun.* L131.
- ECA (2007). European Chemicals Agency. http://ec.europa.eu/environment/chemicals/reach/reach_intro.htm. REACH. Accessed 15 June 2007.
- ECETOC (2002). European Centre for Ecotoxicology and Toxicology of Chemicals (ECETOC): *Outline concept of a pragmatic approach to risk assessment.* Brussels: http://www.ecetoc.org.
- Eekels J (1987). Design methods: possibilities and limits (in Dutch). Delft University of Technology.
- Eijkemans G and Fedetov I (2005). Global implementation strategy of the occupational risk management toolbox (control banding). *Presented at 3ICBW,* 21 September 2005, Pilanesberg, South Africa.
- EINECS (1987). European inventory of existing commercial chemical substances (*EINECS Vols. I - VIII*. Commission of the European Communities, EEC, Brussels, Belgium.
- Enarson DA, Chan-Yeung M (1990). Characterization of health effects of wood dust exposures. American Journal of Industrial Medicine. 17:33-38 .
- ETEAM Conference. The Evaluation of Tier 1 Exposure Assessment Models under Reach ("eteam") project. Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (BAuA); 2014. Available from: http://www.eteam-project.eu/ETEAMConference.aspx

- Evanoff BA, Bohr PC, Wolf LD (1999) Effects of a participatory ergonomics team among hospital orderlies. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* 35(4), 358-365.
- Evans P (2005a). COSHH Essentials. *Presented at the National Control Banding Workshop,* 9-10 March 2005, Washington, DC.
- Evans P (2005b). Silica Essentials and the Chemical Control Toolkit. *Presented at the Third International Control Banding Workshop (3ICBW),* 21 September 2005, Pilanesberg, South Africa.
- Evans P (2005c). COSHH Essentials – Reducing Silicosis. *Presented at 3ICBW,* 21 September 2005, Pilanesberg, South Africa.
- Evans P and Garrod A (2006). Evaluation of COSHH Essentials for vapour degreasing and bag-filling operations. Letter to the Editor. *Ann. Occupational. Hygiene.* 50:641.
- Farris JP, Ader AW, Ku RH (2006). History, implementation, and evolution of the pharmaceutical hazard categorization and control system. *Chemistry Today* 24:5-10 .
- Fernholm A (2008). "Nanoparticles scrutinized for health effects", San Francisco Chronicle, May 12, 2008.
- Feber, le F, Marquart J, Brouwer D, Tielemans E, Tijsen S (2003). Model to assess inhalatoire exposure in SME's (in Dutch). TNO RAPPORT v5520
- Fine LJ, Punnett L, Keyserling WM (1987). An epidemiological study of postural risk factors for back disorders in industry, in P. Buckle (ed.) *Muscular Disorders at Work* (Taylor & Francis, London) 108 -109.
- Fine WT, Kinney WD (1971). Mathematical evaluation for controlling hazards. J Safety Res, 3(4):157-166.
- Fingerhut M, Driscoll T, Imel Nelson D, Concha-Barrientos M, Punnett L, Pruss-Ustin A, Steenland K, Leigh
- Fingerhut M (2008). Global qualitative risk management (control banding) activities. Industrial Health 46:305-307.
- Flanagan ME, Seixas N, Majar M, Camp J, Morgan M (2003). Silica Dust Exposures During Selected Construction Activities. AIHA Journal 64:319–328.
- Flanagan ME, Seixas N, Becker P, Takacs B, Camp J (2006). Silica Exposure on Construction Sites: Results of an Exposure Monitoring Data Compilation Project. J Occupational Environ Hygiene, 3(3):144-52.
- Fleury D, Fayet G, Vignes A, Henry F, Frejafon E, editors (2013). Nanomaterials risk assessment in the process industries: evaluation and application of current control banding methods. Proceedings of the 14th International Symposium on Loss Prevention and Safety Promotion in the Process Industry; 2013.
- Flynn MR and Susi P (2003). Engineering controls for selected silica and dust exposures in the construction industry--a review. *Appl. Occupational. Environ. Hygiene.* 18:268-277.
- Foster KR, Vecchia P, Repacholi MH (2000). Risk management: science and the precautionary principle. Science 288:979-81.
- GAO (1997). General Accounting Office (GAO) Private Sector Ergonomics Programs. Washington, D. C., Health, Education, and Human Services Division. Publication number 97 – 163.

- Gardner RJ and Oldershaw PJ (1991). Development of pragmatic exposure-control concentrations based on packaging regulation risk phrases. *Ann. Occupational. Hygiene.* 35:51-59.
- Garrod A and Rajan-Sithamparananadarajah R (2003). Developing COSHH essentials; dermal exposure, personal protective equipment and first aid. *Ann. Occupational. Hygiene.* 47:577-588.
- Geankoplis G (1978). Transport processes and unit operations. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston.
- Genaidy AM, Al-Shedi AA, Karwowski W (1994). Postural stress in industry. *Applied Ergonomics* 25(2):77- 87.
- Genaidy A, Barkawi H, Christensen D (1995). Ranking of static non-neutral postures around the joints of the upper extremity and the spine. *Ergonomics* 38(9):1851-1858.
- Geraedts R and Wamelink H (2008). Dutch status report: voluntary arrangements for collaborative working in the construction sector. EU Tendor No ENTR/07/008.
- Ghosh A and Mallik A (1986). Manufacturing science. Ellis Horwood Limited, Chichester.
- Ghosh M (1993). Ergonomic job analysis made easy. Safety & Health 78-81.
- Goldsmith DF, Shy CM (1988). Respiratory health effects from occupational exposure to wood dusts. Scandinavian Journal of Work and Environmental Health. 14:1-15.
- Goldsmith DF (1997). The link between silica dust levels, risk assessments, and regulations. J Expo Anal Environ Epidemi 7:385-395.
- Goossens L and Hourtolou D (2003). What is a barrier? Report ARAMIS project Sectie Veiligheidskunde, Technische Universiteit Delft
- Grandjean E and Hunting W (1977). Ergonomics of posture: review of various problems of standing and sitting posture. Applied Ergonomics 8:135-140.
- Guest I (1998). The Chemical Industries Association Guidance on Allocating Occupational Exposure Bands. Ann Occupational Hygiene 42:407-411.
- Guldenmund FW (2000). The nature of safety culture: a review of theory and research. Safety Sci 34:215-57.
- Guney E, Tanyeri Y, Kandemir B, et. al. (1987). The Effect of Wood Dust On The Nasal Cavity And Paranasal Sinuses. Rhinology. 256:273.
- Haddon W Suchman E, Klein D (1964). Accident research: methods and approaches. Harper and Row, New York
- Haddon W (1968). The changing approach to epidemiology, prevention and amelioration of trauma. Am J Public Health, 58(8):1431-1438.
- Haddon W (1973). Energy damage and the ten countermeasure strategies. Human Factors, 15(4):355-366.
- Hagberg M (1981). Work load and fatigue in repetitive arm elevations. Ergonomics, 24(7):543-555.
- Hagberg M and Wegman DH (1987). Prevalence rates and odds ratios of shoulder-neck diseases in different occupational groups. British Journal of Industrial Medicine 44, 602-610.
- Haims MC and Carayon P (1998). Theory and practice for the implementation of 'in-house', continuous improvement participatory ergonomic programs. Applied Ergonomics 29(6), 461-472.

- Hale A and Swuste P (1997). Avoiding square wheels: international experience in sharing solutions. Safety Science 25(1-3):3-14
- Hale A, Ale B, Goossens L, Hiejer T, et al., (2007). Modeling accidents for prioritizing prevention. Reliability Engineering and Systems Safety. 92: 1701-1715.
- Hallock MF, Greenley P, DiBerardinis L, Kallin D (2008). Potential risks of nanomaterials and how to safely handle materials of uncertain toxicity. J Chem H&S, 16(1):16-23.
- Hamill A, Ingle J, Searle S, Williams K (1991). Levels Of Exposure To Wood Dust. Ann. Occupational. Hygiene. 35(4) 397-403.
- Harms-Ringdahl L (1993). Safety Analysis. Principles and practices in occupational safety. Elsevier Applied Sciences, London
- Haslem FA, Hide SA, et al. (2005). Contributing factors in construction accidents. Appl Ergon. 36:27-31.
- Health and Safety Commission (2007). 'Managing Health and Safety in Construction: Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2007', Approved Code of Practice, L144, HSE Books.
- Heinrich H (1929). The foundation of a major injury. National safety News January 19(1);9-11, 59
- Heinrich HW (1941). Industrial Accident Prevention, New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Helland A, Scheringer M, Siegrist M et al. (2008). Risk assessment of engineered nanomaterials: a survey of industrial approaches. Environ Sci Technol 42(2):640-6
- Henry BJ and Schaper KL (1990). PPG's safety and health index system: a 10-year update of an in-plant hazardous materials identification system and its relationship to finished product labelling, industrial hygiene, and medical programs. *Am. Ind. Hygiene. Assoc. J.* 51:475-484.
- Hernbert S, et al. (1983). Nasal and Sinonasal Cancer: Connection Between Occupational Exposure In Denmark, Finland, and Sweden. Scan. J. Work Environ. Health. 9:315.
- Hignett S, Wilson JR, Morris W (2005). Finding ergonomic solutions – participatory approaches. Occupational Med. 55:200-207.
- Hinds WC (1988). Basis for Particle Size-Selective Sampling for Wood Dust. Appl. Ind. Hygiene. 3:67.
- Hogue C (2007). National Research Council blasts risk guidelines. Chem & Eng News January 12, 2007. [http://pubs.acs.org/cen/news/85/i03/8503nrc.html] Accessed 20 July 2009.
- Holliday MG (1985). Dranitsoris, P.; Strhlendorf, P.W.; et. al.: Wood Dust in Ontario Industry: The Occupational Health Aspects. Report to the Occupational Safety and Health branch of the Ontario Ministry of Labour.
- Hollnagel E (2006). Risk + Barrier = Safety? 3rd International Conference Working on Safety, The Netherlands [www.wos2006.nl]
- Holmes N, Lingard H, Yesilyurt Z, De Munk F (1999). An exploratory study of meanings of risk control for long term and acute effect occupational health and safety risks in small business construction firms. J Safety Res. 30(4):251-261.
- Holsapple MP, Farland WH, Landry TD, Monteiro-Riviere NA, et al. (2005). Research strategies for safety evaluation of nanomaterials, part II: toxicological and safety evaluation of nanomaterials, current challenges and data needs. Toxicol Sci 88(1):12-17

- Hovinga, H. and Deurloo A (1984). Manufacturing techniqes (in Dutch). Delft University of Technology.
- Howard J (2008). Prevention through design – introduction. J Saf Res. 39(2):113.
- HSE (1983). 100 Practical applications of noise reduction methods. United Kingdom Health and Safety Executive (HSE). HMSO. London.
- HSE (1993). *100 Practical applications of noise reduction methods*. HSE. HMSO. London (1993).
- HSE (1999) Health and Safety Executive, COSHH Essentials. London, U.K.: HSE.
- HSE (2005). Health and Safety Commission paper HSC/05/55 United Kingdom Health and Safety Executive (HSE). HMSO. London, http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/meetings/hscarchive/2005/050405/c55.pdf.
- HSE (2007). Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Essentials guidance publications, United Kingdom HSE, http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/guidance/index.htm.
- HSE (2008a). Health and Safety Statistics 2007/8, United Kingdom HSE, http://www.hse.gov.uk/statistics/overall/hssh0708.pdf
- HSE (2008b). Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Essentials guidance publications. United Kingdom United Kingdom HSE.
- Hudspith B and Ha AW (1998). Information needs of workers. *Ann. Occupational. Hygiene.* 42:401-406.
- IARC (2006). International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) Titanium dioxide (IARC Group 2B), Summary of data reported, Feb. 2006.
- ICE (1985). *The assessment and control of hazards.* Institute of Chemical Engineers. Rugby, 1985.
- ICRP (1994) *Human respiratory tract model for radiological protection.* International Commission of Radiological Protection Publication 66.
- ILO (1996). Ergonomic Checkpoints: Practical and easy-to-implement solutions for improving safety, health and working condition. ISBN 92-2-109442-1, International Labour Organisation (ILO): Geneva, 1996
- ILO (2005a). Facts on Safety at Work. International Labour Office, Geneva [http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/media_and_public_information/Factsheets/lang—en/docnamer—WCMS_067574/index.htm].
- ILO (2005b). Introductory Report; Decent Work - Safe Work. XVIIth World Congress on Safety and Health at Work. Orlando, Geneva, Geneva www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/safework/wdcongrs17/intrep.pdf
- Ironside P and Mathews J (1975). Adenocarcinoma of the Nose and Paranasal Sinuses in Woodworkers in the State of Victoria, Australia. Cancer. 36:1115-1121.
- IRSST (2009). Best practices guide to synthetic nanoparticle risk management. Report R-599, Institut de recherche Robert-Sauvé en santé et en sécurité du travail (IRSST), Montréal, Québec, Canada. http://www.irsst.qc.ca/en/_publicationirsst_100432.html
- ISO (2012). ISO/TS 12901-1:2012 (published on 11/13/2012) Nanotechnologies – Occupational risk management applied to engineered nanomaterials – Part 1: Principles and approaches

- ISO/TS 12901-2 (2014). Nanotechnologies -- Occupational risk management applied to engineered nanomaterials -- Part 2: Use of the control banding approach [Internet]. International Organization for Standardization; 2014. Available from: http://www.iso.org/iso/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=53375
- Israel BA, Schurman SJ, House JS (1989). Action research on occupational stress: involving workers as researchers. *International Journal of Health Services* 19(1), 135-155.
- Israel BA, Baker EA, Goldenhar LM, Heaney CA, Schurman SJ (1996). Occupational stress, safety, and health: conceptual framework and principles for effective prevention interventions. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology 1(3), 261-286.
- ISO (2007). International Organization for Standardization (ISO) Workplace atmospheres—ultrafine, nanoparticle and nanostructured aerosols—inhalation exposure characterization and assessment, ISO/TR 27628: 2007(E). Geneva: ISO.
- ISSA (2009). The Declaration of Brussels, International Social Security Association (ISSA), section non prevention in construction, Belgium 25 November 2009. http://www.issa.int/prevention-construction
- Jackson H (2002). Control Banding – Practical tools for controlling exposure to chemicals. *Asian-Pacific Newsletter* 9:62-63.
- Jafry, T and O'Neill DH (2000). The application of ergonomics in rural development: a review. *Applied Ergonomics* 31(3), 263-268.
- Jayjock MA, Lynch JR, Nelson DI (2000). *Fundamentals of Risk Assessment for Practicing Industrial Hygienists*. Fairfax, VA, American Industrial Hygiene Association.
- Jensen C, et al. (1993). Trapezius muscle load as a risk indicator for occupational shoulder-neck complaints. International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health 64:415-423.
- Jensen KA, Zalk DM, Van Tongeren M, Bloch D, de Heer C, Northage C, et al. SAP (Science Advisory Panel): A teleconference was organized by the Stoffenmanager consortium to discuss the proposal for Stoffenmanager Nano. TNO Report; 2010
- Johnson W (1973). The management oversight and risk tree-MORT (SAN 821-2). Germantown, MD: U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.
- Jones RM and Nicas M (2004). Evaluation of the ILO Toolkit with regards to hazard classification and control effectiveness." *Presented at 2ICBW,* 1-2 March 2004, Cincinnati, OH.
- Jones RM and Nicas M (2006a). Margins of Safety Provided by COSHH Essentials and the ILO Chemical Control Toolkit. Ann Occupational Hygiene 50:149-156.
- Jones RM and Nicas M (2006b). Evaluation of COSHH Essentials for Vapor Degreasing and Bag Filling Operations. Ann Occupational Hygiene 50:137-147.
- Jones RM and Nicas M (2006c). Author's reply. Ann Occupational Hygiene 50: 643-644.
- Juric A, Meldrum R, Liberda EN (2015). Achieving control of occupational exposure to engineered nanomaterials. J Occup Environ Hyg 12(8):501-8.
- Karlqvist L, Hagberg M, Selin K (1994). Variations in upper limb posture and movement during word processing with and without mouse use. Ergonomics 37(7):1261- 1267.
- Kawakami T, Batino JM, Khai TT (1999). Ergonomic strategies for improving working conditions in some developing countries in Asia. Industrial Health 37(2), 187-198.

- Kawakami T and Kogi K (2001). Action-oriented support for occupational safety and health programs in some developing countries in Asia. International Journal of Occupational Safety & Ergonomics. 7(4):421-34.
- Kellogg P (1909). The Pittsburgh Survey. Charities Publications Committee, New York.
- Koda S, Nakagiri S, Yasuda N, Toyota M, Ohara H (1997). A follow-up study of preventive effects on low back pain at worksites by providing a participatory occupational safety and health program. *Industrial Health* 35(2), 243-248.
- Kogi K (1998). Collaborative field research and training in occupational health and ergonomics. *International Journal of Occupational Health and the Environment* 4(3), 189-195.
- Kogi K (2002). Work Improvement and Occupational Safety and Health Management Systems: Common Features and Research Needs. Indust Health. 40:121-133.
- Kogi K (2006). Advances in participatory occupational health aimed at good practices in small enterprises and the informal sector. Ind. Health, 44:31-34.
- Kogi K and Caple D (2008). Developing ergonomic checkpoints for facilitating practical improvements in small-scale workplaces. SY20-03. *XVIII World Congress on Safety and Health at Work*, Seoul, Korea.
- Kogi K (2010). Integrating occupational hygiene and health: the effectiveness in improving small-scale workplaces. Italian J Occupational and Environmental Hygiene, 1(2):69-75
- Kreuter MW, Bernhardt JM (2009). Reframing the dissemination challenge: a marketing and distribution perspective. Am J Public Health. 99(12):2123-2127.
- Kristenson TS (2005). Intervention studies in occupational epidemiology. Occup Environ Med. 62:205-10.
- Kromhout H and Vermeulen R (2000). Long term trends in occupational exposure: Are they real? What causes them? What shall we do with them? Ann Occup Hyg 44:325-327
- Kromhout H (2002a). Author's reply. *Occup. Environ. Med.* 59:788-789.
- Kromhout H (2002b). Design of measurement strategies for workplace exposures. Occup Environ Med 59:349-354.
- Kroonenberg H, van der and Siers F (1983). Design Methods (in Dutch). Vakgroep Ontwerp- en Constructieleer, Technishce Universiteit Twente, Enschede.
- LaDou J (1996). The role of multinational corporations in providing occupational health and safety in developing countries*. International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health* 68(6), 363-366.
- Lam C, James J, McCluskey R, Hunter R (2004). Pulmonary toxicity of single-walled carbon nanotubes in mice 7 and 90 days after intratracheal instillation. *Toxicological Sciences*; 77: 126-134.
- Lee, EG, Harper M, Bowen RB, Slaven J (2009). Evaluation of the COSHH Essentials: methylene chloride, isopropanol, and acetone exposures in a small printing plant. Ann Occup Hyg. 53 (5):463-474.
- Levine SP, Dyjacka DT (1997). Critical features of an auditable management system for an ISO 9000-compatible occupational health and safety standard. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J 58:291-8.

- Lewis DJ (1980). The Mond fire, explosion & toxicity index. In *Proceedings of the 15th annual loss prevention symposium.* New York: AIChE, 1980.
- LI (2008). Projectrapportage kwarts in de bouw (project report quartz in Construction, in Dutch). Labor Inspectorate (LI), the Hague, the Netherlands. http://docs.minszw.nl/pdf//38/2008/38_2008_6_18355.pdf
- Liao C, Chiang Y, Chio C (2008). Assessing the airborne titanium dioxide nanoparticle-related exposure hazard at workplace. J Haz Mat, 162:57-65.
- Li G and Buckle P (1999) Current techniques for assessing physical exposure to work-related musculoskeletal risks, with emphasis on posture-based methods. Ergonomics 42(5), 674-695.
- Lingard H and Holmes N (2001). Understandings of occupational health and safety risk control in small business construction firms: barriers to implementing technological controls. Const Manag & Econ, 19:217-226.
- Lumens M and Spee T (2001). Determinants of exposure to respirable quartz dust in the construction industry. Ann Occup Hyg 45(7):585-595.
- Lux Research (2004). Sizing nanotechnology's value chain. New York, NY: Lux Research Inc.
- Machida S (2001). Guidelines on occupational safety and health management systems (ILO/OSH 2001). Asian-Pacific Newslett Occup Health Safety. 8:72-3.
- Maidment SC (1998). Occupational hygiene considerations in the development of a structured approach to select chemical control strategies. Ann Occup Hyg 42:391-400.
- Malchaire JB (2004). The SOBANE risk management strategy and Deparis method for the participatory screening of risks. Int Arch Occup Environ Health 77: 443-450.
- Marquart H, Heussen H, Le Feber M, Noy D, et al. (2008). 'Stoffenmanager', a web-based control banding tool using an exposure process model. Ann Occ Hyg 52(6):429-442
- Martin, JM, Zalk, DM (1997); Carpenter shop wood dust control - practical experience to reduce hardwood dust exposures below the ACGIH TLV. Applied Occupational and Environmental Hygiene. 12(9):595-605.
- May DR and Schwoerer CE (1994). Employee health by design: using employee involvement teams in ergonomic job design. *Personnel Psychology* 47, 861-876.
- Maynard A and Kuempel E (2005). Airborne nanostructured particles and occupational health. Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 7: 587-614.
- Maynard A (2007). Nanotechnology; the next big thing or much ado about nothing? Ann Occup Hyg 51: 1-12.
- Mitchel T and Else D (1983). *Noise control in mining: seventy-five noise control solutions*. Victorian Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, Ballarat University College, Victoria, Australia.
- Mitchel T and Else D (1993). *Noise control in mining: seventy-five noise control solutions*. Victorian Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, Ballarat University College, Victoria, Australia.
- Moir S and Buchholz B (1996). Emerging participatory approaches to ergonomic interventions in the construction industry. American Journal of Industrial Medicine 29(4), 425-430.

- Moir S (2005). Ideological influences on participatory research in occupational health and safety: a review of the literature. New Sol: J of Env and Occup Health Policy, 15:15-28.
- Money CD (1992). A structured approach to occupational hygiene in the design and operation of fine chemical plant. Ann Occup Hyg. 36:601-607.
- Money CD (2001). Data solutions for the 21st century: CEFIC's vision and intentions. The European Chemical Industry Council. Appl Occup Environ Hy*g* 16:329-330.
- Money CD (2003). European experiences in the development of approaches for the successful control of workplace health risks. Ann Occup Hy*g,* 47:533-540.
- Money C, Bailey S, Smith M, Hay A, Hudspith B, Tolley D, et al. (2006). Evaluation of the utility and reliability of COSHH Essentials. Letter to the Editor. Ann Occup Hyg 50:642-643.
- Moore JS and Garg A (1995). The strain index: a proposed method to analyze jobs for risk of distal upper extremity disorders. American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal, 56:443-458.
- Moore JS and Garg A (1996). Use of participatory ergonomics teams to address musculoskeletal hazards in the red meat packing industry. American Journal of Industrial Medicine 29(4), 402-408.
- Moore JS and Garg A (1997). Participatory ergonomics in a red meat packing plant. Part II: Case studies. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J, 58(7), 498-508.
- Murie F (2007). Building safety – an international perspective. Int J Occup Environ Health 13 :5-11.
- Nasterlack M, Zober A, Oberlinner C (2008). Considerations on occupational medical surveillance in employees handling nanoparticles. Int Arch Occup Environ Health. 81(6):721-6.
- Naumann BD, Sargent EV, Starkman BS, Fraser WJ, Becker GT, Kirk GD (1996). Performance-based exposure control limits for pharmaceutical active ingredients. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J, 57: 33-42 .
- Nelson D, Chiusano S, Bracker A, Erickson, L, Geraci, C, Zalk DM, et al. (2007). Guidance for conducting control banding analyses. AIHA Guideline 9 – 2007, AEAG07-726.
- Neitzel R, Seixas NS, Camp J, Yost M (1999). An assessment of occupational noise exposures in four construction trades. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J. 60:807-817
- Neitzel R, William D, Sheppard L, et al. (2009). Comparison of perceived and quantitative measure of occupational noise exposure. Ann Occup Hyg 53(1):41-54.
- Nelson DI, Nelson RY, Concha-Barrientos M, Fingerhut M (2005). The global burden of occupational noise-induced hearing loss. Am J Ind Med 48: 446-458.
- Nelson DI and Zalk DM (2010). Control banding: background, critique, and evolution. In: Patty's Industrial Hygiene, Sixth Edition as Chapter 28, Wiley publishers.
- NIOSH (1984). National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Manual Of Analytical Methods, Third Edition, Cincinnati, OH .
- NIOSH (1987). Health Effects of Exposure to Wood Dust - A Summary of the Literature. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control; NIOSH Division of Standards Development and Technology Transfer (1987).

- NIOSH (1992). NIOSH Recommendations For Occupational Safety and Health, Compendium of Policy Documents and Statements, Pub. No. 92-100,U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, Center for Disease Control, Cincinnati OH, (January 1992).
- NIOSH (2006). *Approaches to Safe Nanotechnology: An Information Exchange with NIOSH* Version 1.1.
- NIOSH (2007). Simple Solutions: Ergonomics for Construction Workers NIOSH Publication No. 2007-122. http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/docs/2007-122/floor.html.
- NIOSH (2008). National Occupational Research Agenda: National Construction Agenda for Occupational Safety and Health Research and Practice in the U.S. Construction Sector. Developed by the NORA Construction Sector Council, revised October 27, http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/nora/comment/agendas/construction/pdfs/ConstOct2008.pdf .
- NIOSH (2009). Qualitative risk characterization and management of occupational hazards: Control Banding (CB); a literature review and critical analysis. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 2009–152.
- Noro K and Imada A (Eds.). (1991). Participatory Ergonomics. London, Taylor & Francis.
- Noy D (2004). Development of a software tool for a hazardous substance policy in SME's (in Dutch). TNO Chemie, Arbo Unie
- NRC (1999), National Research Council (NRC) Work-related musculoskeletal disorders: report, workshop summary, and workshop papers. Washington DC.
- NRC (2008). 'Toxicoloog Paul Borm is ongerust over huidige nanoproducten. (Toxicologist Paul Borm is worried about the present nanoproducts), NRC Handelsblad, PCM Uitgevers Pub, NL 16 Aug 2008. NRC (2008) 'Toxicoloog Paul Borm is ongerust over huidige nanoproducten. (Toxicologist Paul Borm is worried about the present nanoproducts), NRC Handelsblad, PCM Uitgevers Pub, NL 16 Aug 2008.
- Nylander LA and Dement JM (1993). Carcinogenic effects of wood dust: review and discussion. American Journal of Industrial Medicine, 24:619-647.
- Oberdorster G, Ferin J, Lehnert B (1994). Correlation between particle-size, in-vivo particle persistence, and lung injury. Environmental Health Perspectives, 102 (S5): 173-179.
- Oberta AF and Fischer KE (2000). Negative Exposure Assessments for Asbestos Floor Tile Work Practices. Within Advances in Environmental Measurement Methods for Asbestos. Beard ME and Rook HL ed. Published by ASTM International, 1999 ISBN 0803126166, 9780803126169 pgs 193-208.
- Oldershaw P (2001). Control banding – a practical approach to judging control methods for chemicals. *J. Prev. Med.* 9:52-58.
- Oldershaw PJ (2003). Control banding workshop, 4-5 November 2002, London. Ann Occup Hyg 47:531-532.
- Oliver T (1902). Dangerous Trades: the historical, social, and legal aspects of industrial occupations as affecting health, by a number of exports. T. Oliver ed., John Murray Publisher, London

- Onos T, Hoonakker PLT, Spee T (2003). Nulmeting in het kader van het arboconvenant kwarts in de afbouwsector. (baseline survey for the working conditions agreement on quartz in the finishing sector, in Dutch) Arbouw, Amsterdam.
- Orthen B (2008). Approaches for the definition of threshold limit values for nanomaterials. OECD Workshop on Exposure Assessment and Exposure Mitigation, 20 Oct 2008, Frankfurt Germany.
- OSHA (1989). Occupational Safety and Health Administration. (OSHA) Code of Federal Regulations, Title 29, Part 1910, "Air Contaminants; Proposed Rule", Federal Register, 54(12):2920, January 19, 1989.
- Ostiguy C, Riediker M, Triolet J, Troisfontaines P, Vernez D (2010). Development of a specific control banding tool for nanomaterials. Expert Comm CES Phys AgentsFrench Agency Food Environ Occup Health Saf Maisons-Alfort Cedex. 2010
- Paik S, Zalk DM, Swuste P (2008). Application of a Pilot Control Banding Tool for Risk Level Assessment and Control of Nanoparticle Exposures. Ann Occup Hyg 52(6):419-428
- Partanen TJ, Hogstedt C, Ahasan R, Aragon A, Arroyave ME, et al. (1999). Collaboration between developing and developed countries and between developing countries in occupational health research and surveillance. Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment, and Health 25(3), 296-300.
- Pheasant S (1986). *Bodyspace: Anthropometry, Ergonomics and Design*. (Taylor & Francis, London).
- Pisaniello DL, Connell KE, Muriale L (1991). Wood Dust Exposure During Furniture Manufacture - Results From An Australian Survey And Considerations For Threshold Limit Value Development. Am. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. J. 52(11):485-492.
- Poland C, Duffin R, Kinloch I, Maynard A, et al. (2008). Carbon nanotubes introduced into the abdominal cavity of mice show asbestos like pathogenicity in a pilot study. Natur Nanotech 20 May p 1-6.
- Powers KW, Brown SC, Krishna VJ, Wasdo SC et al. (2006). Research strategies for safety evaluation of nanomaterials part VI: characterization of nanoscale particles for toxicological evaluation. Toxicol Sci 90(2):296-303.
- Punnett L, et al. (1991). Back disorders and nonneutral trunk postures of automobile assembly workers. Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment, and Health 17:337-346.
- Rainbird G, and O'Neill DH (1995). Occupational disorders affecting agricultural workers in tropical developing countries. *Applied Ergonomics* 26, 185-187.
- Rappaport SM, Goldberg M, Susi P, Herrick RF (2003). Excessive exposure to silica in the US construction industry. *Ann. Occup. Hyg.* 47:111-122.
- Redinger CF and Levine SP (1998). Development and evaluation of the Michigan Occupational Health and Safety Management System assessment instrument: a universal OHSMS performance measurement tool. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J. 59:572-81.
- Redinger CF, Levine SP, Blotzer MJ, Majewski MP (2002). Evaluation of an Occupational Health and Safety Management System performance measurement tool—II: scoring methods and field study sites. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J, 63:34-40.

- Riediker M, Ostiguy C, Triolet J, Troisfontaine P, Vernez D, Bourdel G, et al (2012). Development of a control banding tool for nanomaterials. J Nanomater.
- Robichaud CO, Tanzil D, Weilenmann U, Wiesner MR (2005). Relative risk analysis of several manufactured nanomaterials: an insurance industry context. Environ Sci Technol. 15;39(22):8985-94.
- Roelofs CR Barbeau EM, et al. (2003). Prevention strategies in Industrial Hygiene: a critical literature review. American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal 64:62-67
- Rosenberg BJ, Barbeau EM, Moure-Eraso R, Levenstein C (2001). The work environment impact assessment: a methodologic framework for evaluating health-based interventions. Am J Ind Med 39:218-26
- Rosecrance JC and Cook TM (2000). The use of participatory action research and ergonomics in the prevention of work-related musculoskeletal disorders in the newspaper industry. Applied Occupational and Environmental Hygiene 15(3), 255-262.
- Rosencrantz H, Edvardsson K, Hansson SO (2007). Vision zero – is it irrational? Transport Research, 41(6):559-567.
- Rosskam E (1997). Preventing workplace injuries and illnesses through ergonomics. Geneva, International Labour Organization. *World at Work* 21, 5-8
- RSC (1996). Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC): *COSHH in laboratories, 2nd edition.* London:
- Rubio CA (1995). Ergonomics for industrially developing countries: an alternative approach. Journal of Human Ergology 24(1), 119-123.
- Ruden C and Hansson SO (2003). How accurate are the European Union's classifications of chemical substances. *Toxicol. Lett.* 144:159-172.
- Rundmo T (1996). Associations between risk perception and safety. Safety Sci 24:197-209.
- Russell RM, Maidment SC, Brooke I, Topping MD (1998). An introduction to a UK scheme to help small firms control health risks from chemicals. Ann Occup Hyg, 42:367-376.
- Ryman-Rasmussen JP, Riviere JE, Monteiro-Rieviere NA (2006). Penetration of intact skin by quantum dots with diverse physicochemical properties. Toxicol Sci 91(1):159-165
- Safe Work Australia (2010). Engineered nanomaterials: feasibility of establishing exposure standards and using control banding in Australia. Commonwealth of Australia, http://www.safeworkaustralia.gov.au
- Sargent EV and Kirk GD (1998). Establishing airborne exposure control limits in the pharmaceutical industry. *Am. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. J.* 49:309-313.
- Scheeper B, Kromhout H, Boleij J (1995). Wood-Dust Exposure During Wood-Working Processes. Ann Occup Hyg 39(2):141-154.
- Schneider T (2008). Relevance of dustiness and aerosol dynamics for personal exposure. OECD Workshop on Exposure Assessment and Exposure Mitigation, 20 Oct 2008, Frankfurt Germany.
- Schulte P, Geraci C, Zumwalde R, Hoover M, Kuempel E (2008). Occupational risk management of engineered nanoparticles. J Occup Environ Hyg 5(4):239-249.
- Schulte P, Rinehart R, Okun A, et al. (2008). National Prevention through Design (PtD) Initiative. Journal of Safety Research. 39(2):115-121.

- Seixas NS, Sheppard L, Neitzel R (2003). Comparison of task-based estimates with full-shift measurements of noise exposures. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J. 64:823-829.
- Seixas NS, B Goldman, L Sheppard, R Neitzel, et al .(2005a). Prospective noise induced changes to hearing among construction industry apprentices. Occup Environ Med 62:309-317.
- Seixas NS, Neitzel R, Sheppard L, Goldman B (2005b). Alternative metrics for noise exposure among construction workers. Ann Occup Hyg 49(6):493-502.
- Shahnavaz H (2000). Role of ergonomics in the transfer of technology to industrially developing countries. *Ergonomics* 43(7), 903-907.
- Shreve R (1956). The chemical process industry. McGraw-Hill Books Inc., New York.
- Silk J (2004). The Globally Harmonized System (GHS) of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals: Harmonized Phrases for International Control Banding. *Presented at 2ICBW,* 1-2 March 2004, Cincinnati, OH.
- Simmonds RH (1992). Estimating safety costs. *Accident Prevention Manual For Business And Industry* , 10th edition (National Safety Council, Chicago, Illinois) 291.
- Singleton WT and Whitfield D (1968). The organisation and conduct of a World Health Organisation inter-regional course on ergonomics for developing countries. Human Factors, 10 (6), 633-640.
- Smedbold HT (2004). KjemiRisk - The Norwegian offshore approach to control banding. *Presented 2ICBW,* 1-2 March 2004, Cincinnati, OH.
- Sommerich CM, McGlothlin JD, Marras WS (1993). Occupational risk factors associated with soft tissue disorders of the shoulder: a review of recent investigations in the literature. Ergonomics 36(6):697-717.
- Spee T (2005). Risk assessment from toxic substances and control measures in the Dutch construction industry. *Presented at 3ICBW,* 21 September 2005, Pilanesberg, South Africa.
- Staatscourant (2001). Staatscourant (Government Gazette in dutch) 19 October 2001, p 14. http://www.staatscourant.nl/
- Stern ST and McNeil SE (2008). Nanotechnology safety concerns revisited. Toxicol Sci 101(1):4-21.
- Stetson, D.S., et al. (1991). Observational analysis of the hand and wrist: a pilot study. Applied Occupational and Environmental Hygiene 6(11):927-937.
- Stewart K, Kiefer M, Johnson P, Zalk DM (2005). Establishing Ergonomics in Industrially Developing Countries. *Proceedings SS (K1), International Occupational Hygiene Scientific Conference*, 21 September 2005, Pilanesberg, South Africa.
- Stubbs DA (2000). Ergonomics and occupational medicine: future challenges. Occupational Medicine 50(4), 277-282.
- Suter AH (2002). Construction noise: exposure, effects, and the potential for remediation; a review and analysis. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J. 63:768-789
- Swuste P, Kromhout H, Drown DI (1993). Prevention and control of chemical exposures in the rubber manufacturing industry in The Netherlands. Ann Occup Hyg 37:117-134.
- Swuste P and Hale A (1994). "Databases on measures to prevent occupational exposure to toxic substances." Applied Occupational and Environmental Hygiene 9(1): 57-61.

- Swuste P, Corn M, Goelzer B (1995). Hazard prevention and control in the work environment; Report of a WHO meeting. *African Newsletter* 1:20-21.
- Swuste P (1996). Occupational hazards, risks and solutions. Delft University Press.
- Swuste P, Hale A, Pantry S (2003). "Solbase: a databank of solutions for occupational hazards and risks." Annals of Occupational Hygiene 47(7): 541-7.
- Swuste P (2004). Occupational hazards, risks, and solutions. Presentation at the 2nd International CB Workshop: Validation & Effectiveness of Control Banding. Cincinnati March 1-2.
- Swuste P (2005). Control banding, expansion of range; safety. *Presented at 3ICBW,* 21 September 2005, Pilanesberg, South Africa.
- Swuste P (2007). Qualitative methods for occupational risk prevention strategies in safety, control banding – safety. Safety Science Monitor 11(3). Online journal http://www.monash.edu.au/muarc/ipso/vol11/Issue3/8 Swuste.pdf Accessed 23 Jan 2009
- Swuste P (2008). You will only see it, if you understand it', or occupational risk prevention from a management perspective. Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing, 18:438-53.
- Swuste P, Gulijk C, van Zawaard W (2010). Safety metaphors and theories, a review of the occupational safety literature of the US, UK, and The Netherlands till the first part of the 20th century. Safety Science, 48(8): 1000-1018.
- Swuste P, Zalk DM (2013). Options in managing hazards and risks of nanomaterials. Proceedings, International Symposium on Occupational Safety and Hygiene.
- Takala J (1999). Introductory report of the International Labour Office, International Occupational Safety and Health Information Centre, Geneva, International Labour Office, 10p.
- Takala J (2010). Present, new and emerging risks. Italian J Occupational and Environmental Hygiene, 1(2):60-62.
- Tait K (2004). Control banding: an improved means of assessing and managing health and safety risks at Pfizer. *Presented at the Second International Control Banding Workshop (2ICBW),* 1-2 March 2004, Cincinnati, OH.
- Tandhanskul N, Duangsa-Ad S, Pongpanich C, et al. (1995). Experiences of successful action programmes for occupational health, safety, and ergonomics promotion in small scale enterprises in Thailand. Journal of Human Ergology 24(1), 105-115.
- Thackrah CT (1832). The effects of arts, trades, and professions. Baines and Newsome Publishing, Leeds.
- Thienen G van and Spee T (2008). Health effect of construction materials and product. J Applied Occupational Sci. 1:2-23.
- Thinksafe (2007). Noise management in the construction industry: a practical approach. Worksafe. http://www.docep.wa.gov.au/Worksafe/Content/Safety_Topics/Noise/Further_information/Noise_management_in_the_constr.html
- Thomas K, Aguar P, Kawasaki H, Morris J, et al. (2006). Research strategies for safety evaluation of nanomaterials, part VIII: international efforts to develop risk-based safety evaluations for nanomaterials. Toxicol Sci 92(1):23-32

- Thorpe A and Brown RC (1995). Factors Influencing The Production Of Dust During The Hand Sanding Of Wood. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J 56:236-242.
- Tielemans E (2007). Evaluation of the Stoffenmanager. Presented at the Occupational Hygiene Conference, 17-19 April, Glasgow.
- Tielemans E, Noy D, Schinkel J, Heussen H, et al. (2008) Stoffenmanager exposure model: development of a quantitative algorithm. Ann Occupational Hyg 52(6):443-454
- Tijssen S, le Feber M, Heussen H, West J, Noy D (2004). A new tool for small and medium enterprises to work safely with hazardous substances. *Presented at 2ICBW,* 1-2 March 2004, Cincinnati, OH.
- Tischer M (2001). Helping SMEs to manage risks from chemicals in the workplace. *Proceedings from an international workshop,* 26-27 November 2001, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Zeist: TNO Nutrition and Food Research.
- Tischer M (2002). Current BAuA/GTZ research on occupational exposure and control strategies: recent results from various industrial areas and from Indonesian SMEs. *Presented at the First International Control Banding Workshop (1ICBW),* 4-5 November 2002, London, UK.
- Tischer, M, Bredendiek-Kamper S, Poppek U (2003). Evaluation of the HSE COSHH Essentials exposure predictive model on the basis of BAuA field studies and existing substances exposure data. Ann Occupational Hyg 47:557-569.
- Tischer M and Scholaen S (2003). Chemical management and control strategies: experiences from the GTZ pilot project on chemical safety in Indonesian small and medium-sized enterprises. Ann Occupational Hyg 47:571-575 (2003).
- Tischer M, Bredendiek-Kamper S, Poppek U, Packroff R (2009). How safe is control banding? Integrated evaluation by comparing OELs with measurement data and using Monte Carlo simulation. Ann Occupational Hyg 53 (5):449-462.
- Tjoe Nij E and Heederik D (2005). Risk assessment of silicosis and lung cancer among construction workers exposed to repsirable quartz. Scand J Work Environ Health. 31(2):49-56.
- Tolley JC, Zalk DM, Custodian Quality Improvement Team (1998). A custodian journal on grassroots ergonomics. Proceedings of the American Society of Safety Engineers (ASSE) International Professional Development Conference 1998, Seattle, 14 – 17 June, 247-254.
- Topping M (2002a). Design of measurement strategies for workplace exposures: Letter to the editor." Occupational Environ Med 59:788.
- Topping M (2002b). COSHH Essentials from concept to one stop system." *Presented at the First International Control Banding Workshop,* 4-5 November 2002, London, UK.
- Tran C, Buchanan D, Culen R, Searl A, Jones A, Donaldson K (2000). Inhalation of poorly soluble particles. II. Influence of particle surface area on inflammation and clearance. Inhalation Toxicology; 12(12): 1113-1126.
- Tsuji JS, Maynard AD, Howard PC, James JT, Lam C (2006). Research Strategies for Safety Evaluation of Nanomaterials, Part IV: Risk Assessment of Nanoparticles. Toxicol Sci 89(1):42-50.
- UIC (1999). Chemical Industry Union (UIC): *[Tool for evaluation of the risks to the chemicals],* [Document in French] *technical document DT 63.* Paris.

- US (1992). U. S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit: AFL--CIO v. OSHA, CA 11, No. 89-7185 (July 7, 1992)
- USCB (2004). Country Business Patterns (NAICS), U.S. Census Bureau (USCB). http://censtat.census.gov/cgi-bin/cbpnaic/cbpdetl.pl
- Van Duuren-Stuurman B, Vink SR, Verbist KJ, Heussen HG, Brouwer DH, Kroese DE, et al (2012). Stoffenmanager Nano version 1.0: a web-based tool for risk prioritization of airborne manufactured nano objects. Ann Occupational Hyg. 2012;56(5):525–41
- Vedder J and Carey E (2005). A multi-level systems approach for the development of tools, equipment and work processes for the construction industry. Appl Ergon, 36(4):471-80.
- Vincent R and Bonthoux F (2000). [Evaluation of chemical risk : hierarchisation of "risk potential".] [Article in French] *I Cahiers de notes documentaires - Hygiene et securite du travail* 179:29-34.
- Visser JP (1998). Developments in HSE management in oil and gas exploration and production. in Hale A.R. & Baram M. (Eds.) Safety management: the challenge of organizational change. Pergamon. Oxford
- Waehrer GM, Dong XS, Miller T, et al. (2007). Costs of Occupational Injuries in Construction in the United States. Accid Anal Prev, 39(6): 1258–1266.
- Wagner GR (1995). The inexcusable persistence of silicosis. Am Public Health Assoc, 85(10):1346-1347.
- Warheit DB, Borm PJ, Hennes C, Lademann J. (2007a). Testing strategies to establish the safety of nanomaterials: conclusions of an ECETOC workshop. Inhal Toxicol 19(8):631-43.
- Warheit DB, Webb TR, Reed KL, Frerichs S, Sayes CM (2007b). Pulmonary toxicity study in rats with three forms of ultrafine-TiO2 particles: Differential responses related to surface properties. Toxicol 230(1):90-104.
- Warheit DB, Sayes CM, Reed KL, Swain KA (2008). Health effects related to nanoparticle exposures: Environmental, health and safety considerations for assessing hazards and risks. Pharm & Therap, 120(1): 35-42.
- Waterson A (2007). Global construction health and safety – what works, what does not, and why? Int J Occupational Environ Health. 13(1):1-4.
- Weinstein MG, Hecker SF, et al. (2007). A roadmap to diffuse ergonomic innovations in the construction industry. Int J Occupational Environ Health 13:46-55.
- Westgaard RH and Winkel J (1997). Ergonomic intervention research for improved musculoskeletal health: a critical review. International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics 20, 463-500.
- Whitehead LW, Fruend T, Hahn L (1981). Suspended Dust Concentrations and Size Distributions and Qualitative Analysis of Inorganic Particles from Woodworking Operations. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J, 42:461.
- Whitehead LW (1982). Health Effects Of Wood Dust - Relevance For An Occupational Standard. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J, 43(9):674-678.
- WHO (2003). Review of the WHO Activities in Occupational Safety and Health, 13th Session of the Joint ILO/WHO Committee on Occupational Health, Geneva.

- Wisner A (1989). Variety of physical characteristics in industrially developing countries – ergonomic consequences. International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics 4, 117-138.
- Woodward KN, A. McDonald, and S. Joshi (1991). Ranking of chemicals for carcinogenic potency--a comparative study of 13 carcinogenic chemicals and an examination of some of the issues involved. Carcinogenesis 12:1061-1066.
- Yang W, Peters JI, Williams RO (2008). Inhaled nanoparticles—A current review. Int J of Pharma, 56(1-2):239-247
- Yap SM (2004). Assessing the utility of the ILO Toolkit in Singapore. *Presented at 2ICBW,* 1-2 March 2004, Cincinnati, OH.
- Zalk DM, Tolley, JC, Kim, Y (1997) Grassroots ergonomics to modify custodial training procedures. Professional Safety 42, 21-25.
- Zalk DM, Biggs, TW, Perry, CM, Tageson, R, et al. (2000) Participatory ergonomics approach to waste container handling utilizing a multidisciplinary team. Proceedings of the International Ergonomics Association 14th Triennial Congress/HFES 2000, San Diego, 31 July – 4 August, 324-327.
- Zalk DM (2000) Exposure assessment techniques to reduce occupational uptake of asbestos and lead for maintenance activities. IOHA Cairns 2000 Abstract 60, Cairns, Australia [http://nla.gov.au/nla.cat-vn2019109].
- Zalk DM (2001). Grassroots ergonomics: initiating an ergonomics program utilizing participatory techniques. Ann Occupational Hygiene, 45(4):283-289.
- Zalk DM (2002). Participatory occupational hygiene; a path to practical solutions. Asian-Pacific Newsletter 9:51
- Zalk DM (2003). Control banding principles to reduce musculoskeletal disorders; the ergonomics toolkit." *Proceedings V5(327), International Ergonomics Association Congress*, Seoul, South Korea.
- Zalk DM (2006a). Control banding's human health-based risk management strategies*. Presentation at American Industrial Hygiene Conference* Roundtable 221, Chicago, IL.
- Zalk DM (2006b). Practical prevention in safety; from control banding to barrier banding. *Proceedings* 17(5), *International Working on Safety Conference*, 15 September 2006 Eemhof, The Netherlands.
- Zalk DM, T Spee (2008) Barrier banding and the construction toolbox. *Proceedings* SY20-04*, XVII World Congress on Safety and Health at Work*, 1 July 2008 Seoul, South Korea.
- Zalk DM, Nelson DI (2008). History and evaluation of control banding: a review. J Occupational Environ Health 5(5):330-346
- Zalk DM, Paik S, Swuste P (2009). Evaluating the Control Banding Nanotool, a qualitative risk assessment approach for controlling nanomaterial exposure. J Nanopart Research. 11(7):1685-1704.
- Zalk D.M., (2009). Can control banding be better than traditional industrial hygiene? 5th International Control Banding Workshop, Session 69, ICOH Congress, Cape Town, South Africa
- Zalk DM (2010). Control Banding; a simplified, qualitative strategy for the assessment of risks and selection of solutions. TU Delft publisher, p.210.

- Zalk DM and Heussen H (2010). Outcomes of the 6th International Control Banding Workshop. IOHA 2010 Conference Proceedings, Rome, Italy, 28 September.
- Zalk DM, Kamerzell R, Paik S, Kapp J, Harrington D, Swuste P (2010a). Risk level based management system: a control banding model for occupational health and safety risk management in a highly regulated environment. Industrial Health, 48(1):18 - 28.
- Zalk DM, Swuste P, Hale A (2010b). Barrier banding: a concept for safety solutions utilizing control banding principles. Submitted to Safety Science, May 2010.
- Zalk DM, Spee T, Gillen M, Lentz TJ, Garrod A, Evans P, Swuste P (2011). Review of qualitative approaches for the construction industry: designing a risk management toolbox. Saf Health Work;2:105-21.
- Zalk DM, Paik S (2010d). Control Banding and nanotechnology. The Synergist, 3:26-29.
- Zalk DM, Paik SY (2011). Qualitative risk assessment and control banding. In: Handbook of Occupational Exposure to Nanomaterials, Chapter 6, Elsevier publisher.
- Zalk DM, Heussen, H (2011). Banding the world together; the global growth of Control Banding and qualitative occupational risk management. Saf Health Work; 2(4):375-9.
- Zwaard W, Passchier W (1995). Risicobepaling en risicobeheersing. Tijdschrift voor toegepaste Arbowetenschap 8;8-12 [in Dutch]
- Zwaard W, Goossens L (1997). Relatieve Ranking als hulpmiddel voor risico-evaluatie. Tijdschrift voor toegepaste Arbowetenschap 10;10-15 [in Dutch]

- **Further International CB Workshop information and research can be obtained from the following websites**:
- ICBW1. First International Control Banding Workshop London England Nov. 4-5, 2002. http://www.bohs.org/mod.php?mod=fileman&op=view_cat&id=14
- ICBW2. Second International Control Banding Workshop Cincinnati Ohio, 1-2 March 2004. http://www.acgih.org/events/course/controlbandwkshp.htm.
- ICBW3. Third International Control Banding Workshop Pilanesburg South Africa 21 September 2005. http://www.saioh.org/ioha2005/Proceedings/SSI.htm
- ICBW4. Fourth International Control Banding Workshop Seoul South Korea, 1 July 2008. http://www.ioha.net
- ICBW5. Fifth International Control Banding Workshop Cape Town South Africa, 25 March 2009. http://www.ioha.net
- ICBW6. Sixth International Control Banding Workshop Rome Italy, 27 September 2010. http://www.ioha.net
- ICBW7. Seventh International Control Banding Workshop London England (Sessions 8c, 9c, 11c, 12c) http://www.ioha2015.org/ioha-2015-presentations

Volunteer Group 2

OSHA will never have enough resources and time to develop PELs for all toxic chemicals. Thus the agency has to make strategic decisions about which ones justify the effort. For a small number of chemicals where there is evidence the PEL is too high, a considerable number of workers are exposed to these high levels and there is credible evidence, these PELs should be prioritized and regulated as individual substances (similar to silica). Existing standards like the CAL-OSHA PELs, NIOSH RELs and ACGIH TLVs and prioritizations should be used whenever possible to guide this effort.

Some chemicals for which PEL updates might be a priority would include:

- 1-bromopropane
- Carbon monoxide
- Diesel exhaust
- Glutaraldehyde
- Manganese
- Mercury
- N-hexane
- Perchloroethylene
- Styrene
- Toluene

Other priorities where chemicals could be grouped and regulated as a class include:

- Isocyanates
- Welding fumes
- Chemotherapeutic agents
- Halogenated anesthetic agents with nitrous oxide
- Metal working fluids
- Dust (not otherwise characterized)

These chemicals and groups can be tackled a few at a time each year (this in itself may require a dramatic increase in OSHA's standard setting budget, which is currently only about 3% of their overall budget) over a decade or two. OSHA should encourage substitution of safer less toxic alternatives whenever possible.

Beyond high priority chemicals/groups, OSHA needs to require a risk assessment process whereby companies, using the information obtained from the chemical Safety Data Sheets (SDS) in conjunction with knowledge of how the chemicals will be used (exposure conditions) can do a simple risk assessment and develop control strategies. The new ANSI A10.49 standard for control of chemical hazards in construction follows this approach and has gotten significant support from industry. This approach is similar to control banding, which has been used successfully in several industries in the US and more comprehensively in Europe.

Task-based regulation is also a very useful approach and OSHA has had some success with this approach in the asbestos and lead standards, and the agency is pursuing this approach as well in its proposed silica rule. The goal is to identify high exposure tasks and effective controls for those tasks. Mandating those controls whenever the tasks are done effectively reduces overall exposures significantly. Such

requirements make compliance much easier for employers, don't require as much air sampling, and are easier for compliance officers to enforce.

As thousands of new chemicals enter commerce each year, OSHA simply cannot keep up. The burden to protect worker health must be placed on employers and chemical manufacturers to do risk assessments and plan accordingly. An essential element in this process must be active worker involvement in the risk assessment and the development, implementation and monitoring of control plans. Workers must have the authority to question and challenge the assessments and control plans.

Volunteer Group 3

General Comment: We applaud this challenging and much needed effort by OSHA. As occupational epidemiologists, we often assign exposures to workers or worker groups after they occur, using available information from company records, or more often, in the absence of that, from other sources, the literature, or professional judgment. We see any new regulation as an opportunity to require appropriate recordkeeping regarding worker exposure information, including information characterizing the workplace, work force, work practice, and exposure groups.

Recommendation: Recordkeeping will be particularly important if qualitative or semi-quantitative methods are adopted such as hazard banding or control banding. We urge this topic be added to the list of considerations for whatever regulation is developed. (Reference "AIHA Exposure Assessment Strategies", 4th Edition, Chapter 9).

General Comment: While epidemiology is mentioned several times in the report, it is not included in the specific analyses that could be used now or in the future to determine appropriate PELs.

Recommendation: Epidemiological studies should be described within the context of model generation/validation, as a weight-of-evidence input parameter, and encouraged where employee populations at risk exposure are large and/or the potential health effects are in question.

Comment: This statement indicates the importance of epidemiological studies - "The Agency generally prefers high quality epidemiologic studies for dose-response analysis over experimental animal models, provided there is adequate exposure information and confounding factors are appropriately controlled" (pg. 61392, para 2, line 15); however, it suggests that if the studies are not of "high quality" they should not be used to evaluate potential health effects of chemicals.

Recommendation: Include in this section, or elsewhere, that epidemiological studies should be used in a weight-of-evidence and/or directly to support development of PELs. Further, there should be a discussion of what would be considered a "high quality epidemiology study" and whether there is a consensus on types and number of epidemiology studies required to establish causal relationship between an exposure and outcome.